DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 604	UD 027 828
AUTHOR	Bauch, Patricia A.; Small, Thomas W.
TITLE	Attitudes and Values of Inner-City Catholic School Parents: Development and Analysis of a Survey. Technical Report #1.
PUB DATE	Sep 90
NOTE	135p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Catholic Schools; Factor Analysis; High Schools; *Measurement Techniques; *Parent Attitudes; *Parent Participation; Parents; Parent School Relationship; Questionnaires; Reliability; Research Design; Research Methodology; Statistical Surveys; *Urban Education; Validity

ABSTRACT

This report contains accounts of the scale construction, reliability, and validity of an instrument used to collect parent survey data in a study of Catholic inner-city high schools. The survey was designed to ascertain parents' involvement in their children's schooling based on parental knowledge, reasons for school choice, expectations and personal background characteristics, and perceptions of the school chosen. These data are useful in determining the extent to which parents interact with a school of choice, which is thought to have a significant impact on the academic and social performance of their children. The report is introduced by a discussion of the conceptualization of the survey instrument, based on the research literature, the rationale for selecting the research methodology used, and an explanation of the researchers' approach to scale construction. The main analytic tools were factor analysis, followed by reliability analysis, to assess further the internal consistency of the resulting dimensions. The report also explains how the survey was administered, describes its parent population, and suggests how the instrument could be modified for future use. Appendixes include the questionnaire and a master key for analysis showing all variables and variable combinations. The report includes 32 tables. (AF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED327604

ATTITUDES AND VALUES OF INNER-CITY CATHOLIC SCHOOL PARENTS: DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS OF A SURVEY

Technical Report #1

Patricia A. Bauch
The University of Alabama

and

Thomas W. Small
Pennsylvania State University-Harrisburg

September, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia A. Bauch
Univ of Alabama
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

UD 027 828

ERIC ABSTRACT

AUTHORS: Patricia A. Bauch, Thomas W. Small

TITLE: "Attitudes and Values of Inner-City Catholic School Parents: Development and Analysis of a Survey"

ABSTRACT:

This report contains accounts of scale construction, reliability, and validity of an instrument used to collect parent survey data in a study of Catholic inner-city high schools. The report is introduced by a discussion on the conceptualization of the survey instrument, based on the research literature, the rationale for selecting the research methodology used, and an explanation of the researchers' approach to scale construction. The main analytic tools were factor analysis followed by reliability analysis to further assess the internal consistency of the resulting dimensions. The report also explains how the survey was administered, describes its parent population, and recommends how the instrument could be modified for future use. The appendix contains the questionnaire and a master key for analysis showing all variables and variable combinations.

Table of Contents

Pages

Introduction....................1-2

Parent Survey- Conceptualization....................2-6

Parent Survey- Theoretical Construction & Design....................6-11

Parent Survey- Initial Administration & Design Analyses....12-17

Parent Survey- Preliminary Statistical Analyses....................18-19

Parent Survey- Construct Development & Theoretical Analyses....................19-25

Parent Survey- Construct/Scale Analyses of Internal Consistency....................25-40

Parent Survey- Construct/Scale Statistical Analyses........40-44

Parent Survey- Recommendation and Conclusions....................44-49

  Strengths....................44-46

  Limitations....................46-49

Footnotes....................50-51

References....................52-55

Tables....................56-110

Appendices....................111-128

List of Tables

Pages

Table 1 - Survey Models Used to Develop the Parent Survey..56-58

Table 2 - Reliability Measures of Survey Models Used in the Construction of the Parent Survey....59-60

Table 3 - School Demographic Characteristics..................61

Table 4 - Parent Sample by the Five Schools..................62

Table 5 - Parent Survey Response Coding Scheme.............63-67

Table 6 - Parent Survey Missing Response Data..............68-70

Table 7 - Chronology of Statistical Analyses for Parent Survey......................................71

Table 8 - Parent Survey Constructs and Scales..............72-73

Table 9 - Construction of the Constructs/Scales............74-83

Table 10 - Reliability Analysis: School Goals-Original Items....................................84

Table 11 - Reliability Analysis: School Goals-Construct Subscale...............................85

Table 12 - Reliability Analysis: Reasons for School Choice-Original Items.................................86-87

Table 13 - Reliability Analysis: Reasons for School Choice-Construct Subscale...............................88

Table 14 - Reliability Analysis: School Problems-Original Items.................................89-90

Table 15 - Reliability Analysis: School Problems-Construct Subscale...............................91

Table 16 - Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Characteristics-Original Items....................................92

Table 17 - Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Characteristics-Construct Subscale...............................93

Table 18 - Reliability Analysis: Participation-Original Items....................................94

Table 19 - Reliability Analysis: Participation-Construct Subscale...............................95

Pages

Table 20 - Reliability Analysis: Decision Makers-Original Items....96-97

Table 21 - Reliability Analysis: Decision Makers-Construct Subscale....98

Table 22 - Reliability Analysis: Communication-Original Items....99

Table 23 - Reliability Analysis: Reasons for Non-Participation-Original Items....100

Table 24 - Reliability Analysis: Reasons for Non-Participation- Construct Subscale....101

Table 25 - Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Knowledge & General Characteristics-Construct Subscale....102

Table 26 - Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Emphasis-Original Items....103

Table 27 - Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Emphasis-Construct Subscale....104

Table 28 - Reliability Analysis: Importance of Participation- Original Items....105

Table 29 - Reliability Analysis: Importance of Participation- Construct Subscale....106

Table 30 - Reliability Analysis: Want to Make Decision & Importance of Knowing School- Original Items..107-108

Table 31 - Reliability Analysis: Want to Make Decision & Importance of Knowing School-Construct Subscale....109

Table 32 - Reliability Analysis: Parent Satisfaction with School- Construct Subscale....110

List of Appendices

Pages

Appendix A - Parents of Students in Catholic High Schools : A National Study............111-120

Appendix B - Parent Survey- Variable Combinations Analysis Variable Key- The Catholic University of America......................121-128

Attitudes and Values of Inner-City Catholic Parents: Development and Analysis of a Survey

Introduction

Educational researchers at The Catholic University of America (CUA) completed the field study component of the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA) study on the impact of inner-city Catholic secondary schooling on low-income students during Spring of 1985. Data for the larger study were gathered and analyzed by Search Institute, Minneapolis, Minnesota and were reported by NCEA (NCEA, 1986).

An integral part of the descriptive study, conducted by CUA, was the collection of information on parents' attitudes and behaviors at five inner-city Catholic high schools selected for special study based on selection criteria intended to identify "effective" schools serving lower-income students (Bauch, Blum, Taylor, Valli, 1985). While direct interviews with parents were conducted, the number was limited due to time constraints. Quantitative data, however, were collected via a Parent Survey (See Appendix A). The survey was designed to ascertain parents' participation and involvement with their child's schooling based on parental knowledge, reasons for school choice, expectations and personal background characteristics (e.g., level of education), and perceptions of the school chosen. These data are useful in determining the extent to which parents interact with a school of choice that is thought to have a significant impact on the academic and social performance of their student/child.

The data reported on the Parent Survey were analyzed using several statistical techniques. This paper serves as a technical reference on the construction, content, and statistical analyses of the survey. Statistical tests were selected based on generally acceptable procedures in analyzing data as well as to satisfy the research questions of the investigators. Subsequent analyses are included as addenda to this document.

Parent Survey Conceptualization

Research based on survey data collection currently dominates the social sciences. The most effective methodology for determining the relative incidence, distribution and interrelations of naturally occurring phenomena is survey research (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 410). Moreover, of the types of survey techniques available, questionnaires or written surveys are the most popular among social scientists (Gallup & Rogers, 1984). The survey is an efficient and generally effective way to collect data from a large population.[1] Survey research is also ideally suited to meet the rigors and conditions of population sampling. A survey or questionnaire can be tailored to measure a specific phenomena within or across populations (Kerlinger, 1973). The flexibility and relative ease of administration and analysis makes the survey a desirable choice for data collection by social scientists.

The principle purpose of the survey developed and used by the

CUA field study team was to collect data on parent characteristics, as well as their perceptions, beliefs, expectations, and goals for their child's secondary schooling. There have been, to date, only a limited number of data sets addressing these parent/schooling topics (See Greeley, 1982). Thus, a comprehensive parent/school data set would be an invaluable aid in understanding the conditions and circumstances for parents' interactions with schools of choice. Herein lies the primary mission of the Parent Survey.

The Parent Survey was constructed from three principle survey references (See Table 1):

1) The Parent Survey published and administered by the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc. as a part of the Study of Schooling (Goodlad, 1984).
2) The National Catholic Educational Association- A National Portrait of Catholic Secondary Schools Survey (NCEA, 1983).
3) Queries generated from the research questions formulated by the CUA field research team.

Sources one and two above provided the research team with a measure, or components of a measure, which were tested and standardized. The Parent Survey developed for the Study of Schooling was piloted on a sample of approximately 175 parents (77% white; 23% minority) of secondary students in California (Overman, 1979). This survey, in its final form was completed by 6,900 parents of secondary school students across the country[2] (Overman, 1979).

Elements of the NCEA Catholic Secondary School Survey were also used in the conceptualization and development of the Parent Survey. During the fall of 1983, surveys were administered to Catholic secondary school principals, teachers, and students across the United States. Parents, however, were not directly surveyed. Nonetheless, the Principal Survey contained several sections akin to the research questions of the CUA research team. These sections were adapted (e.g., re-worded) to suit the needs of the research questions and the Parent Survey. The NCEA survey was completed by principals at 910 Catholic secondary schools (NCEA, 1985). Approximately seventeen percent of the student population of these schools surveyed are minority. The minority status of the student or parent samples in these studies is highlighted since the study of inner-city, low-income (which translates for the most part into a minority status) was under study.

The third source contributing to the conceptualization and development of the Parent Survey was the research agenda and the subsequent research queries that evolved. The global purpose of the high school study as expressed by NCEA was:

1) To create a national portrait of Catholic secondary schools. In addition to describing the characteristics of Catholic high schools in general, this study compared and contrasted the programs, resources, facilities, and personnel and policies of schools that serve students from low-income families with those that enroll students with other economic characteristics.

2) To assess how effectively Catholic secondary schools serve students from low-income families. Student outcomes to be addressed included academic achievement, life-skills, values, and religion. By assessing these

> four areas, the study evaluated how well the Catholic secondary school achieves its dual mission--to deliver a quality academic experience and to stimulate growth in values and faith consistent with the Catholic tradition (Bauch, et al, 1985).

The specific objectives of the CUA field study team, then, included:

--determining what Catholic secondary schools do to promote growth and learning among students from low-income families; and

--determining what characterizes Catholic secondary schools that seems effective in fostering growth and learning among students from low-income families (Bauch, et al, 1985).

The purpose of the Parent Survey was to gather data from an important constituency of the high schools--parents--from whom no data had thus far been gathered. Such data would provide a more comprehensive database from which the study's goals and objectives can be addressed. This demanding research assignment, which focused on five inner-city high schools, presented many logistical complications. Time constraints posed the largest research obstacle to the field study team. The research agenda, however, presented an excellent opportunity to collect data on a myriad of events or conditions that may be present in the types of schools studied. Thus, there was a need to collect a significant amount of data within a relatively short period. The most efficient, and perhaps effective, solution to this problem rested with the development of a survey to query the schooling triad of teachers, students and parents. The field study team devoted a significant amount of time to the planning and development of survey instruments, especially a parent survey. The remainder of this document shall be devoted to discussion on the evolution, construction and analysis of the Parent Survey.

Parent Survey - Theoretical Construction and Design

The design and, in some cases, the format of the Parent Survey was patterned after the survey instruments that served as the original models (See discussion above). Since the survey's target population was low-income families, special attention was given to the wording of directions and survey items to maximize an understanding of the requirements in completing the task. Historically, the surveying of low-income, inner-city families has not met with great success. A typical survey return rate for this population is usually below eight percent, while the national average household response rate is approximately thirty percent (Gallup, 1983). The length of surveys and the non-comprehension of procedures and questions are often cited as the primary reasons for the low return rate for low-income, inner-city families. Conciseness and clarity are especially important when designing an instrument to survey this population.

The Parent Survey is eight pages long (See Appendix A). The cover page introduces the nature and purpose of the survey. Basic directions in completing the survey are also included. Parents are reassured that all responses are confidential and shall be protected by the research team.

The Parent Survey is divided into three parts. Part One examines the respondent (e.g., mother) and obtains household and family composition. These data are used to classify single-parent families. The sociological research literature is replete with case studies of single parents and their importance in school performance[3]. The first section also reveals information about family composition and size. Family composition and size, coupled with family income, are long-standing indices of the United States Government Bureau of Census in determining the poverty level statistics[4]. Also, states (e.g., Pennsylvania) use family size and composition as a standard for issuing welfare monies and government subsidized food aid programs, such as Food Stamps[5]. Thus, family size and composition are co-determinants of a family's socio-economic status. Questions in Part 1 are designed to ascertain the number of children attending the school under study and, also, any siblings who may have previously attended this school. Patterns in parental selection of a school for their children can be studied with the aid of these data.

Section 2 examines parental involvement at the school, reasons for school choice, the amount of parental knowledge of the curriculum, and goals for the school. Each of these topics have received research attention, although some less than others. Studies have shown that parent expectations[6] directly impact on academic performance indices of students (Woelfel & Haller, 1971; St. John, 1972; Gigliotti & Brookover, 1975; Entwisle & Hayduk, 1978). In general, the research suggests that parental expectations influence school achievement. The dynamic interplay between parental expectations and childrens' academic achievement is continuing to receive educational and sociological research attention (Boocock, 1985).

Parent involvement has been shown to have a positive impact not only on the child's academic performance but on other schooling experiences of the child[7]. Researchers (e.g., Marjoribanks, 1979) indicate that parent involvement of almost any form or type enables the child/student to do better academically. Thus, a primary interest of the CUA field research team was the degree and manner in which lower-income, inner-city parents involve themselves in the educational processes of their child. The Parent Survey examines involvement by querying parents on the importance and frequency of participation in school activities, making decisions related to the school and the interaction with teachers or school officials to monitor their child's schooling. Coleman, et al (1982) contends that low-income inner-city families fail to provide the appropriate stimulation for their children's academic achievement. Further, Greeley (1982) found a differential effect on the degree and types of involvement between low-income, inner-city public and Catholic school parents. In both previously cited studies, the researchers conclude that parental involvement, especially direct involvement in monitoring academic performance (e.g., homework), yields fruitful results for the parents and the child/student.

Parents' reason(s) for choosing a particular school is beginning to receive research attention, in light of the issue of school vouchers. Limited research has been devoted to this topic, especially to issues involving choice in public versus private education. Greeley (1982) reviewed reasons for school choice using the High School and Beyond data (Coleman, et al, 1966). But, the list of reasons was restricted to five "forced-choice" classifications. Cibulka, et al (1982), in their study of inner-city private schools, concluded that parents choose private schools based on their perceptions or beliefs that private schools offer a "better" education. Academic reputation is the paramount reason for choosing a school[8]. The Parent Survey corrects the limited "forced-choice" format by providing parents with a comprehensive listing of reasons for school choice. The list was compiled from the survey models (discussed above) as well as a review of the research literature (e.g., Cibulka, et al, 1982). Thus, the reason(s) why parents choose the schools under study was an important research question for the CUA field study team.

The research team was also interested in examining parents' knowledge about the school and their child's schooling experiences. Once again, limited research has been devoted to perceptions of parental knowledge about a school. Parental knowledge of school is closely allied to interactions and involvement with the school and has an influence on parents' survey responses. It stands to reason that parents who are involved with the schooling process will acquire knowledge about the school, either directly or vicariously. These assumptions prompted the development of questions designed to ascertain the degree of parental knowledge about the schools under study.

Similarly, the relationship between parents' goals for school and the perceived school goals provides an interesting study. The congruence between parents' desires and perceptions was addressed in the mega-study on schooling conducted by Goodlad (1984). The results indicate, however, a weak association between the perceived school goals and the school goals desired by parents. Further, there reportedly was an even greater disparity between parental and states' goals for schooling. A study of school goals is important since goals may serve to stimulate involvement and be related to school choice. Parents who perceive their goals for schooling to be aligned with actual school goals, may be more inclined to participate in the schooling process. This assumption may be studied since the Parent Survey examines the congruence between desired and perceived parental goals for schooling.

Part Three of the Parent Survey is designed to investigate parent, child and family socio-economic, political and religious status. A plethora of research exists on the effects of socio-economic (SES) factors on family life and school achievement[9]. Coleman, et al (1966), Jencks, et al (1972), Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore (1982) and Greeley (1982) cited the effects of SES on the quality of school experiences and academic performance. These researchers causally link SES factors to school attendance, performance and outcomes (e.g., college entrance). Thus, the effects of SES cannot be overlooked or even minimized when studying parent/school interactions. The Parent Survey does not deviate from this research norm. The third section of the survey questions parents on educational attainment, income, housing, race, financial assistance for school and religio-political affiliations or beliefs. This data is useful in validating differences, which have been documented by the aforementioned researchers, between high and low SES parents and families. Also, the contribution of the child/student to the family's income is investigated. The survey designers were most interested in the effect of a child/student working outside the home and homework monitoring. Student employment, homework and academic achievement suggest a potentially interesting correlational study.

In summary, the purpose of this section was to outline the theoretical conceptualization of the Parent Survey. A review of the theoretical foundations and the evolution of this instrument is necessary to aid in utilization and interpretation. The forthcoming section shall describe the design and the administration and subsequent statistical analyses of the Parent Survey.

Parent Survey - Initial Administration and Design Analysis

The Parent Survey (See Appendix A) is an eight page survey, containing thirty-seven (37) questions. Several of these questions are comprised of multiple items, which expands the actual number of items requiring responses to 192. There are 545 response options (e.g., Not a Problem, Minor Problem, Major Problem). There are six questions with both multiple response items and two or more response parts (Questions- 9-13,15). For example, Question 9 is a two-step question requiring a response for each of 26 items on the first part and a single selection of one of the twenty-six items to complete the second part. The instructions to complete this and other like questions are provided.

The Parent Survey did not have the benefit of a pilot administration. Severe time constraints prevented the piloting of this survey instrument on a sample parent population. Nonetheless, the Parent Survey is a derivative of several surveys that were, in fact, field tested and determined to be statistically reliable measures (See Table 1). Those sections of the model instruments used to create the Parent Survey possessed significant scale reliability coefficients (alphas)(See Table 2). Thus, these components continue to be individually reliable and contribute to the overall reliability of the survey (Nunnally, 1978). There is of course statistical phenomena that result when using this type of process in survey development (e.g., inflated error-terms). However, the developers of the Parent Survey consider the various sections (or even questions) of the instrument to be more useful than attempting to survey, generate or analyze a single outcome. Those sections of the Parent Survey that were not modeled after an existing document were developed based upon findings reviewed in the research literature. Thus, each section is unique for purposes of statistical analysis and interpretation. Most survey instrument designs are oriented in this direction as opposed to developing a single-purpose measure (Kerlinger, 1973).

The Parent Survey was administered to parents at five inner-city Catholic high schools in five geographic regions of the country. Table 3 provides a demographic overview of the five schools. These particular schools were selected from a nine school sample. The nine school sample was determined by the Search Institute based on services provided to low-income students that were assessed as "reflective" responses by the surveying of secondary school teachers. Geographic location, the number (percentage) of minority and low-income students served, the gender of the student population, and other organizational features were the primary criteria used to select the five schools for field study.

The field research was conducted during February and March of 1985. A team of two researchers spent approximately one week in each school conducting interviews, observing classrooms, and administering surveys. A comprehensive analysis on each school was submitted to the NCEA for inclusion in their report on the servicing of low-income students in Catholic secondary schools

(NCEA, 1986).

The research team decided to administer the survey to all parents of students in each school. The purpose was to ensure a respectable return rate for analysis. One school, however, was not included in this plan. A selected random sampling methodology was utilized since parents at this school participated earlier in a school-generated survey, similar to the Parent Survey, near the time of the visit by the field research team. School officials wanted to avoid a duplication of survey tasks. The sampling plan consisted of the selection of every sixth student, who was determined to reside in a low-income family, of grade 9 through 12. Thus, low-income students were oversampled at this school to compensate for the small sample size and to ensure that low-income families would be adequately represented in the school sample. Parents of the students selected were asked to complete the survey.

The Parent Survey instruments were distributed at the beginning of the weeklong site visit. In all cases, distribution involved the students hand-carrying the surveys to their parents or legal guardians. Students were reminded daily by school personnel and field researchers to encourage their parents to complete and return the surveys within the same week. Most surveys were collected at the schools by the field study teams, however, a few schools did forward some late returning surveys to CUA several weeks after the site visit. The distribution and collection process was for the most part effective. The parent populations in each of five schools were very cooperative in completing the Parent

Survey. Much of the credit for the return rate rests with school personnel (e.g., teachers) who prompted students, and even parents, to complete and return the survey.

A total of 1,702 Parent Surveys were distributed at the five schools. Of this number, 1070 usable surveys were completed and returned by parents. The 63% return rate was acceptable for quantitative analyses. Table 4 examines the distribution and return rate among the five schools studied.

Parent Survey questions are essentially multiple choice. Likert-type and discrete response styles are utilized. The respondent is given three or four gradient options to complete the items. Various headings employ the Likert format (See Appendix A). This response style is of benefit in those sections of the survey where parents' insights and attitudes toward the school are queried. The discreet response style is equally used in the Parent Survey. There are several questions where a definitive response is required (e.g., Do you participate in...?). With discrete response styles, the occurrence of compliance or non-compliance to an item is of interest, whereas the use of continuous scoring format allows the measurement of the degree of compliance or non-compliance (Nunnally, 1978). Both response scoring styles are equally "at-home" on a survey. However, careful attention must be given to any comparative analyses of these response styles to ensure that the results are accurately reported.

The coding of the Parent Survey was straight-forward. Table 5 reveals the coding scheme for each question on the survey. The concept the item measures and item response style dictated the assignment of codes. In all cases of continuous response style items, the most desirable of the response options received the highest value (Note: Part II; 30-31 most desirable items are scored in reverse order--low to high). The coding assigned to a response option merely served for classification of responses. The codes did not serve as weights for any of the subsequent statistical analysis. Discretely scored items were assigned values of 2 for "Yes" and 1 for "No." Again, the assignment of these values were only for categorizing responses to the survey items. Several questions required the respondent to list an actual number (e.g., How many adults live in home?). These answers were classified by the actual numbers provided by the respondents. Missing responses or illegible entries were coded with the survey-wide missing value designation of 9.

Missing responses often pose a problem during analyses of survey data (Nunnally, 1978). This is often cited as the primary limitation to survey research (Anoble, 1983). The Parent Survey, with 1070 respondents, required 190,102 responses for a one hundred percent completion rate, no missing responses. This is a most unrealistic expectation. Nonetheless, only five (5) percent, or 10,110, responses were missing or unscorable. As is the case with the overall return rate by parents, the Parent Survey achieved remarkable success in completeness. In the large-scale longitudinal study on schooling, Coleman, et al (1982) reported a missing response rate of over ten percent in parent responses to the survey instruments used in this study. Table 6 provides an analysis of the missing responses for each question on the Parent Survey. The data suggest that multiple step questions, those with two or more steps for completion, resulted in the largest number of missing values. This directly reflects the difficulty experienced by the respondents in understanding and acting on the survey instructions. The length of the survey and a declining lack of interest by the respondents probably contributed to the missing values for these types of questions.

All statistical analyses of the Parent Survey were performed on an IBM-Personal Computer (AT)[c] using The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences for the Personal Computer Plus (SPSS+) (Norusis, 1986). SPSSPC+ is comparable to the SPSSX (Nie, et al., 1985), offered on many university mainframe systems. CUA subscribes to SPSSX. Like its mainframe cousin, SPSSPC+ is able to perform all univariate and many bi- or multivariate statistical techniques. Also, the size of the statistical request is only limited by the amount of the processing and storage capabilities of the PC-hardware. No significant difficulties were encountered in completing the statistical studies requested by the field study team. Table 7 lists all the statistical measures used in the initial analysis of the Parent Survey data. This list is not final since research interest in this data set continues to grow.

Parent Survey- Preliminary Statistical Analyses[10]

The survey data were manually read into a log file. Each survey was assigned an alphanumeric code (e.g., X001). The alpha code designated the school and the three digit number identified the parent surveyed. Surveys that were incomplete (e.g., missing pages) or incomprehensible were excluded from the data entry process. A total of 1,070 cases were accepted for data entry; 13 were discarded for the aforementioned reasons.

The first step in data analysis was the determination of the descriptive statistics. The Frequency program module of SPSSPC+ was used. This data "run" aided the research team in analyzing trends or oddities in the data while serving as a check for data entry errors. The Frequency program provided the following statistics:

1) Distribution of responses by item response categories
2) Measures of central tendencies (e.g., mean)
3) Missing data information

Since the frequency data represented the entire sample, a primary research interest was the examination of differences in response styles among the schools. Thus, the data were classified by item response category across the four schools using the Crosstabs program. A two-way crosstabs analysis was performed for each question on the Parent Survey. The intersection of an item response category and a school creates a "cell" containing the classification of responses unique to that particular variable combination. The Crosstabs program yields the following analyses:

1) Row, Column, Total cell frequencies and variances
2) Tests of significance between the cells (e.g., Chi-square)
3) Missing data information

The Crosstabs application is useful in examining the distribution and association of responses across two or more variables. This statistical application yields several tests of significance. The appropriate selection of the significance test for crosstabulation should be an apriori decision based on the hypotheses being posited (Glass & Stanley, 1970).

The results of the initial statistical procedures were analyzed by the research team. Since the data set was large, almost 200 questions/variables, survey constructs were generated to manage and prepare the data for more complex and revealing statistical procedures. The forthcoming section examines the evolution of the Parent Survey constructs and their analyses.

Parent Survey- Construct Development and Theoretical Analyses

The initial data analyses provided the research team with a baseline understanding of response patterns and tendencies. However, the data set was unwieldy and not particularly useful in developing an understanding of the theoretical and statistical implications of the findings. The second phase of data analysis was initiated with the development of constructs that would provide the theoretical framework for synthesizing the voluminous parent data set. The constructs would operationally serve as scales for the grouping of like survey items/questions.

The educational, sociological and psychological research literature served as the primary reference source for the formation of each construct. Limited research attention has been devoted to the collection and analysis of a comprehensive parent data set that addresses a multitude of parent/school issues, concerns and events (Greeley, 1982). Thus, the research team reviewed a plethora of literature that focused on specific parent/school effects.

Based on the research literature review, a conceptual framework evolved that housed eight constructs (See Table 8). The constructs represent a wide range of parent/school relations and events. Once the constructs were established, the items/questions on the Parent Survey were reviewed and categorized by educational researchers at CUA. Sometimes, survey items/questions were combined to represent one item or variable (See Table 9). This resulted in a more compact and manageable parent data set. To better understand the constructs, the conceptual basis and rationale for each shall be briefly reviewed.

The first construct was labelled **Individual Factors.** The item/variables included under this construct related to those survey questions that serve to identify the survey respondent and their political beliefs, religious beliefs, socio-economic status and personal schooling experiences. Several of these item/variables are research worthy, especially those cited in previous research, and shall be briefly highlighted. Included under this heading are item/variables related to the socio-economic conditions of the family, i.e., educational attainment, income, and housing situation. The formation of this construct was not terribly difficult. The research literature is replete with studies related to factors of socio-economic status (SES) and student performance (Majoribanks, 1979; Wexler, 1976; Clark, 1983; Boocock, 1985). Since the purpose of the Parent Survey is to provide descriptive data on parents for the study of inner-city schools, SES factors are extremely important. The relationship of SES to the other items/variables is a significant focus of the overall research agenda, which is studying the effects of parental involvement in inner-city schooling.

A significant relationship exists between parents' educational attainment and the academic achievement of students according to several researchers (e.g., Woelfel & Haller, 1971; Pugh, 1976). These studies indicate that parents with a high school or beyond education had higher expectations for their children's educational advancements than those who failed to graduate from high school. Also, Coleman, et al (1982) and Greeley (1982) found differential effects between Catholic and non-Catholic parents in relation to involvement with the school, aspirations for their children and time spent monitoring child's educational activities. Parental political ideologies or affiliations may impact on the reason for selecting a particular school for their child. This poses interesting research questions. In summary, there has been sufficient research attention devoted to the items/variables grouped under the first construct of **Individual Factors** to warrant their inclusion and study.

The second construct is entitled **Family Factors.** This construct includes such items as identifying the number of children attending the same high school, home conditions (e.g., crowding), financial aid and parents' expectations for child's educational attainment. These items are useful in describing family conditions that may impact on a child's schooling experience. For example, Parent Expectations for Child's Educational Attainment is an important research topic. Therefore, there is sufficient research attention devoted to the study of parental expectations to justify this construct category. Seginer (1983), in a comprehensive review of the research literature concluded that parent expectations appear to be both a cause and an effect of academic achievement. There is, however, a need for continued research on parent expectations, especially those of inner-city parents and their effects on student achievement indices.

The third construct is **Parent Expectations of School.** Parent Survey questions that addressed school goals and reasons for choosing the school under study were clustered under this construct. Goodlad (1984) examined parental goals for school in A Study of Schooling (ASOS). He found that parents wanted a diversity of goals for schooling. Intellectual, social, vocational and personal goals were identified as the categories most important to parents surveyed for ASOS. Similarly, there is diversity among parents on reasons for choosing a school for their children. While academic reputation and achievement associated with the school are often the primary reasons parents select private schools over public schools (Cibulka, et al., 1982; Greeley, 1982; Bryk & Holland, 1984; Bauch & Small, 1986), a variety of other reasons were also chosen. Nonetheless, it is important to investigate the multiple relationships that exist between reasons for school choice and other factors of parental SES, involvement, expectations and goals for schooling.

The fourth construct is labeled as **Parent Perceptions of School**. This construct is devoted to those items/variables that questioned parents on school problems, school goals most emphasized by the school and characteristics of the school curriculum. Parents' perceptions and, in turn, beliefs may play a critical role in the degree of involvement with their childrens' education and the school itself. Perceptions may or may not be based on a true body of knowledge of the schooling experience. Also, there is research that suggests that a parent's previous schooling experience serves as the basis on which parents choose a school for their child and decide on the type and degree of involvement (Seginer, 1983). Thus, parents' perceptions about what is going on in their childrens' schools may play a direct role in determining the parents' interactions with the schools.

The fifth construct is entitled **Parent Involvement in School Related Activities**. This construct contains those items/variables that pertain to participation, decision making, communication and reasons for non-participation. Bauch (1985) provided an overview of parent involvement concerning the roles of parents in curriculum and school improvement. The consensus of research on this topic is that parental involvement is both an important and effective force in enhancing childrens' academic performance and improving the conditions of schooling. The item/variable categories used to create this construct are all related to parental roles as participators, decision makers and communicators outlined in the research literature (Bauch, 1985).

The sixth construct is **Parent School and Curriculum Knowledge.** This construct represents the parents' general school knowledge, knowledge of general characteristics of the curriculum and curriculum emphasized by the school. The question "How much do parents know about their children's school?" can be investigated by examining this construct. Parental knowledge can be skewed by previous schooling experiences and their perceptions of what goes on in a school. The degree of parental involvement and satisfaction will be affected by the parents' body of knowledge about the school. Thus, it is important to study how knowledgeable the parents are about their childrens' schools.

The seventh construct is **Parent Attitudes toward School.** This construct represents two themes: 1) the parents' view on the importance of participation; and 2) the parents' need to be involved in the decision making process at their childrens' school. Attitudes often dictate actions (Kuklinski, 1984). Thus, it is necessary to explore those items/variables on the Parent Survey that are attitudinal probes. Since there are several questions of this design, a construct was developed based on a theoretical context for analysis and interpretation of these items/variables.

The eighth, and final, construct addresses **Parent Satisfaction with School**. Parent satisfaction with their child's school is the focus of this construct. Satisfaction is assessed by exploring the parent's attitudes toward the school's curriculum. The curriculum provides a common focus for parental satisfaction and concerns about schooling. Thus, the construct was developed to allow the grouping of items/variables on the Parent Survey that address parental satisfaction with aspects of the schools' curricula.

In summary, the purpose of this section was to outline the eight constructs and provide an overview of the theoretical origins of each. The research literature was used extensively, not only to provide the conceptual framework for each construct, but also as an aid in grouping and categorizing items/variables from the Parent Survey. The forthcoming section converts the constructs into item/variable scales and provides the statistical verification for the eight constructs.

Parent Survey- Construct/Scale Analysis of Internal Consistency

Each item on the Parent Survey serves as a variable. Hence, the term variable shall denote a particular question or item or grouping of questions/items. The variables were assigned to a construct based on the following criteria:

1) What does the variable directly measure?

2) What does the variable indirectly measure?

3) How does the variable relate to other variables measuring the same subject or topic?

Redundancy of items measuring the same concept is a frequent characteristic of survey designs (Kidder, 1981). During revisions of the survey instrument or statistical analyses, like-items can be removed or combined with similar items to form one unit of measure. The latter strategy was employed to manage the large parent data set. Items were also grouped based on theoretical considerations. The 192 original items were synthesized to 143 variables within the eight constructs. While this is a large number of variables for statistical manipulations, the management of the variables was not terribly cumbersome since analyses were performed either within or between construct/scales. Table 9 reveals the transformations that were performed on the original items/ questions. Combined items were taken from the same or similar questions on the Parent Survey. This facilitated the transformations since the items being combined were represented by the same coding scheme. The calculation of the new variable was straight-forward. The original items were averaged to create new values for each parent case. Values were rounded to the nearest whole integer to avoid decimal gradations. The missing response values (9,99,999) remained unchanged and unaffected by these transformations.

Once the items were appropriately cataloged under one of the eight constructs/scales, reliability analyses were performed to determine the statistical effectiveness of each scale. Reliability, simply stated, refers to the extent to which a test or measure yields the same results on repeated administrations; in other words, a measurement of consistency of a survey or test instrument. There are several methods for determining the reliability (i.e., alternate forms, split-half, coefficient alpha and test-retest). The Parent Survey does not have an alternate form, nor can it serve as a measure against itself, as happens with split-half reliability techniques. Due to the nature of the survey task and the survey instrument design, the most appropriate test of reliability is coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951). The test for coefficient alpha determines the extent to which each variable is related to every other variable within a particular scale. It should be noted that the coefficient alpha for dichotomously scored items (e.g., yes-no) is known as the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (Nunnally, 1978). Potential sources of error when using coefficient alpha are item sampling differences and the heterogeneity of the domain of parents' expectations, perceptions, knowledge, and so on, sampled by the question or item. Overall, coefficient alpha is the most widely used measure of reliability and the most appropriate for demonstrating the effectiveness of the internal consistency of the Parent Survey.

An item-correlation matrix and a reliability coefficient (alphas) were obtained for six of the eight scales (See Tables 10-32). The **Individual** and **Family Factors** scales were excluded from reliability analysis due to the diversity of topics addressed by each construct. The inter-relationship of demographic variables do not always prove to be significant due to the similarities in what these items measure (e.g., socio-economic factors) (Rosenberg, 1968). Thus, indices that measure these relationships may not prove to be statistically fruitful. Demographic variables are usually mutually exclusive when compared to each other. The variables on the **Individual Factors** and **Family Factors** scale are most appropriately used to measure associations with other variables than with each other. These variables are often desirable independent variables for social science researchers (Robinson & Shaver, 1969).

Parent Expectations of School is the third scale to be created. This scale contains two subscales that address parents' goals for school and reasons for school choice. The reliability coefficient for the original thirteen item scale is .93 (See Table 10). Most of the original school goals survey items goals are significantly correlated with one another (See Table 10). Consequently, the coefficient alpha for the construct scale-School Goals is a highly meaningful .87 (See Table 11). A review of the correlation matrix finds all four variables to be significantly related. The alpha level would be unchanged with the deletion of any of the variables on this subscale. Intellectual goals (XX) and Vocational/Survival goals (YY) form the most significant relationship on the subscale (r = .69)(See Table 11). Conversely, Intellectual goals (XX) and Personal/Religious goals (SS) generate the lowest correlation (r = .53). Parents perceive academic goals to be allied with vocational/survival (aka: basic learning or living skills), with personal/religious goals being somewhat incongruent with intellectual goals for their childrens' school. Respondents found, however, all the goals for school to be important.

The original twenty-five item school choice scale earned an alpha of .96 (See Table 12). A review of the correlation matrix of Table 12 reveals that most reasons for school choice are moderately to highly related. The construct scale Reasons for Choosing the School also earned a high reliability coefficient (.90)(See Table 13). This subscale proves to be an accurate measure of school choice. The highest correlational relationship among the school choice variables is between Academic/Curriculum (Q) and Religion/Values (V) and (r = .75). Parents who select Catholic schools for academic training also value the religious education and moral training of their children. Significant relationships are also found between the important choice reasons of Religion/Values (V) and Convenience/Safety (U) (r = .71) and Religion/Values (V) and Child's Choice (R)(r = .69). Religious, moral, and character development are as important in parents' selection criteria as factors of convenience and safety (i.e., school location and safe environment). The concept of structure and discipline are important facets of Catholic schooling and influence parents' school choice decisions (Greeley, 1982). Children also appear to find their parents' school of choice to be consonant with their own. Athletic programs offered by the five schools are also attractive to children and their parents during the school selection process. Any of the variables in this subscale could be deleted with minimal impact on maintaining an acceptable alpha level. Thus, it can be concluded from the scale analysis that parents find academic, social and religious/moral factors to be equally important as school goals and reasons for choosing a school for their children.

The fourth scale, **Parents Perceptions of School**, contains two subscales: School Problems and School Curriculum Characteristics including the variable related to the parents' perceptions of the school goal most emphasized. Table 14 shows the reliability analysis for the 19 original school problems. The coefficient alpha (.98) and the correlation matrix present a highly reliable scale. Likewise, the seven item construct subscale of School Problems obtained an alpha of .96 (See Table 15). There are several significant correlations between subscale variables. A correlation coefficient of .96 exists between School Problems of Moral/Ethical Behavior (DX) and School Finances (EA). School Finances has also been linked (r= .81) to Curriculum/Teachers (DY). The financial conditions of each school studied were viewed as a significant problem. A possible explanation of these findings could be that parents consider teachers to be underpaid and the school lacking either the facilities or curriculum materials to provide students with additional educational and social structure they (parents) perceive as lacking at the five schools. Parents also may feel that teaching would concomitantly improve if teachers are adequately compensated. The problem of School Finances is also correlated (r

= .78) to the problem of Poor Attitude/Lack of Interest (EJ) at the schools. The lack of adequate monies is a major problem currently facing private schools. This issue probably impacts directly on parents faced with rising tuition costs. The variable Student Body Composition (EO) is also seen as a basic school problem. Four of the five school studied were single sex high schools. This variable was linked to problems of Curriculum/Teachers (DY) (r= .71), Finances (EA)(r= .69) and Poor Attitude/Lack of Interest (EJ)(r= .75). Several of these relationships are obvious, such as Student Body Composition and Poor Attitude/Lack of Interest. The others may be a result of the strong intra-scale statistical effect of this variable, much like the School Finances variable. The alpha value of the scale would not be severely affected if any of the variables would be dropped from the scale. Parents were unable to discern a single, predominant problem facing their childrens' schools.

The 14 original item scale-School Curriculum Characteristics generated a reliability coefficient of .97 (See Table 16). These items are significantly correlated. Consequently, the construct subscale-School Curriculum Characteristics yielded an alpha coefficient of .97 (See Table 17). Most correlations among the scale variables are high (r =.70-.87). However, there are several statistically noteworthy associations. There is a direct correlation (r = .81) between Liberal/Modern Beliefs (AH) and Conservative/Traditional Beliefs (AI). Parents, therefore, perceive their childrens' schools to be adequately representing liberal and conservative viewpoints in a nonpartisan manner. Parents also perceive Homework (AM) and Discipline (AN) to be active components of the schools' curriculum (r = .86). Homework has also been correlated with Religious Education (AP) emphasis in the curriculum (r = .87). Religious Education and Discipline (AN) are also significantly interrelated (r = .84); both are probably expected by most parents who place their child in a parochial school. In general, parents may perceive discipline and religion to be inherent in the curriculum while viewing homework as the manifestation of the structure of the schooling experience. A deletion of any of the subscale variables would not seriously change the obtained alpha level. In summary, parents perceive the Catholic secondary schools, studied here, to have a well-rounded and representative curriculum.

The fifth scale, **Parent Involvement in School Related Activities**, has four subscales: Participation, Decision-Making, Communication and Reasons for Non-Participation. The amount of parent Participation is measured by eleven items. The original scale earned an alpha coefficient of .96 (See Table 18). Since these highly correlated, the grouping of the original items into five variables produced alpha of .98 for the Participation construct subscale (See Table 19). All correlational relationships among the five variables are meaningful. The highest correlation was achieved between Teachers & Aides (DE) and Board Members (DG) (r = .93). This finding suggests that parents who serve as classroom teachers or aides also have a tendency to serve on school boards. This seems logical since both participation activities requires parents to be highly involved with the school. Parents who serve as Teachers & Aides are also more apt to act as Helpers (DM) during school events or activities (r = .89). Homework Monitors (DO) and Attenders (DH) garnered the correlation coefficient of .89. Thus, parent responders who monitor their childrens' homework are also more likely to attend their childrens' activities at school. The alpha value would remain somewhat unchanged with the deletion of any one of the subscale variables.

The second scale is related to parents as Decision Makers. The significant relationship of the original fifteen items produced an alpha of .98 (See Table 20). The fifteen items were consolidation into six variables to form the Decision Makers construct subscale. The six item Decision Making subscale produced a .97 alpha coefficient (See Table 21). Based on this result, the scale provides an accurate measure of parents' involvement via decision making. There are also numerous significant inter-item correlations. The relationship with the most magnitude (r = .91) is parents' decision making on Home/School Relations (BS) and School Goals (BV). It can be inferred that parents who make decisions on home/school relations are also involved in decisions related to school goals. Deciding the goals for a school also may directly relate to curriculum and operational policies. Thus, the School Goal variable was significantly correlated with decisions on Curriculum (BM) (r = .82) and School Policy (BL)(r = .86). Apparently, if parents are providing input on decisions about one of the variable/categories, there are likely to be also involved in other decisions making categories outlined by this subscale.

Parents as Communicators is the focus of the third subscale. The subscale contains seven variables that intend to define the type and degree of communication between parents and the schools. The alpha level derived for this scale was .76 (See Table 22). Nonetheless, there are very few significantly correlated variables on this subscale. Three variables, K- Setting for Talks(Telephone), L- Setting for Talks (Parent Meetings) and M- Setting for Talks (Parent-Teacher Conferences) are highly intercorrelated. These relationships are expected since the variables are sub-parts of the one question on the Parent Survey. An example of this phenomenon is the depressing effect on the alpha level if any of the three variables would be dropped from the subscale. But, there is a poor mix among the remaining subscale variables. The correlation coefficients are generally weak, thereby rendering this subscale to be an ineffective measure of parent communication. A descriptive analysis of the data supports this notion since parents responded poorly to these survey items addressing communication with the school.

The fourth subscale measures the Reasons for Non-Participation of parents in schooling activities or events. The original six variable subscale netted a substantial reliability coefficient (alpha = .97) (See Table 23). The collapsing of two of the original items into one variable produced a highly reliable five item subscale for Reasons for Non-Participation (alpha = .96). Meaningful correlational relationships exist between Child Care

(DQ) and Attitude-Language Differences (DS)(r = .87), Transportation (DR) and Delegation (DU) (r = .84) and Child Care (DQ) and Transportation (DR) (r = .86). The results, inferentially, find parents who cite child care as a reason for non-participation also do not attend school events due to the attitude of school personnel or a language barrier. Also, parents with transportation difficulties are more likely to concede the responsibility of schooling of their children to the school. Child care and transportation appear to most often prevent parents from attending school functions and activities.

The sixth scale, **Parent School and Curriculum Knowledge**, is composed of two subscales. One subscale is devoted to analyzing parents' school and curriculum knowledge while the second subscale focuses on the type of curricular topics emphasized at their children's schools. The twelve item curriculum knowledge subscale derives from the fourteen original item scale--Curriculum Characteristics (See Table 16). The grouping of several original items, and the addition of the item related to school knowledge, produced a subscale alpha coefficient of .98 (See Table 25). This subscale can be considered a reliable measure of parents' general knowledge of school. Several significant variable combinations were found on the correlation matrix. Parents not only perceive (See narrative on Scale V), but know that Liberal/Modern Beliefs-Attitudes (AH) and Conservative/Traditional Beliefs-Attitudes (AI) are equally represented in the schools' curricula (r = .83). The significant relationship (r = .89) between Homework (AM) and

Discipline (AN) validates the parents' impressions that both variables are conjointly operative in their childrens' school. Discipline (AN) (r = .87) and Helping the Poor (AT) (r = .92) are also interrelated with Religion (AP). The combination of these variables produces a curriculum that reflects the mission of Catholic schools that is evident to the parents surveyed. Additionally, parents find the ideas of Vatican II (AR) related to the components of the school curriculum that address Social Justice Issues (AU) (r = .91). This evidence suggests that Vatican II doctrine had an effect on raising the consciousness of schools in addressing social justice issues. The thirteen variables would not alter the alpha if deleted from the subscale. Parents' knowledge about the curriculum is not related to their general knowledge about the school. While this subscale measures parents' knowledge of schooling, the second is directed at determining curriculum topics that are stressed by the schools.

The second subscale measure parents' perceptions of Curriculum Emphasis. While topics are identical with those in the first subscale, the response scoring style provides the basis for a differential application and analysis. The original scale, comprised of fourteen items, highly reliable measure (alpha = .97) of Curriculum Emphasis (See Table 26). A twelve item subscale on Curriculum Emphasis was formed by combining items several items on the original scale. This construct subscale earned a reliability alpha of .96 (See Table 27). Again, this can be considered an accurate measure of curriculum importance. Not surprisingly, parents consider both Liberal/Modern Beliefs-Attitudes (AV) and Conservative/Traditional Beliefs-Attitudes (AW) to be stressed in the school curriculum (r = .86). This is a consistent relationship throughout all examinations of the schools' curricula. An interesting duo-variable correlation (r = .81) exists between Vatican II Ideas (BG) and Theory of Evolution (BH). The schools, according to parental observations, apparently stress theories of evolution as much as the ideologies of Vatican II. If this is so, the Catholic secondary school studied are providing students with unbiased educational experiences. This is an interesting topic for further exploration. Also, significant relationships exist between the curriculum emphasis of Vatican II ideas and the opportunity for Students to Express Personal Feelings (BF) (r = .79) and Social Justice Issues (BJ) (r = .77). The findings would suggest that the teachings of the Church incite Catholic educators to address the personal and social awareness of the students. However, parents also believe that theories of evolution will also sensitize students to social justice issues based on the statistical relationship between these two variables (r = .72). Homework (BA) and Discipline (BC) are also highly correlated (r = .80). Apparently the curricula of the schools studied, according to parents, include religious, social and self-development experiences for the students.

Parent Attitudes toward School is the eighth scale to be constructed. Three separate parental attitudes are measured: 1) Importance of Participation at School; 2) Parents Want to Make Decisions (on selected topics) and; 3) Importance of Knowing School. Two subscales (and a single item scale--Importance of Knowing School) were formed to evaluate these attitude questions. The original Importance of Participation at School scale is comprised of twelve items. The items in this scale are significantly related evidenced by the coefficient alpha (.93) (See Table 28). The twelve items on the Importance of Participation at School scale were collapsed into a five item construct subscale. The coefficient alpha of .69 denotes this subscale to be a weak measure of this construct (See Table 29). However, a study of the correlation matrix finds several significant variable alliances. The combination with the greatest magnitude (r = .89) exists between Board Members (CT) and Teachers & Aides (CR). This would infer that parents who want to participate on school boards or committees also would volunteer their time as substitute teachers or classroom aides. Further, parents who would serve on boards or committees would attend (Attenders-CU)(r = .84) school functions and events. It is only worthy to note that parents find Homework Monitoring (DB) to be significant despite what other roles they would fulfill at the school (e.g., Board Member). The variable Helpers (CZ) is poorly correlated with the other variables in this small subscale. If this variable were deleted from the subscale, the alpha coefficient would rise to .94. A probable explanation for this effect is that parents did not respond positively (noting a need to participate in school tasks) to this variable since they see themselves as already acting as helpers for school activities or events. Thus, the result would be a low or negative response to the question/item that related to this topic. This would account for the poor interaction of this variable with the others in the subscale.

The fifteen item Parents Want to Make Decision scale proved to be a highly reliable measure (alpha = .97) (See Table 30). Since most of these items are significantly related, the collapsing of the fifteen items into eight produced a significant subscale. An alpha coefficient .88 was obtained for the eight items (See Table 31). Parents who want to make decisions about Curriculum (CD) concomitantly want to be involved with school Finance (CE) (r = .88), School Policy (CB) (r = .89) and School Goals (CM) (r = .83) decisions. The variable that measures the parental attitude of the Importance of Knowing School (H) was not significantly correlated with the other seven items. Therefore, parents' desire to make school related decisions is not related to the importance of knowing the school.

The final scale measures **Parent Satisfaction with School** originated with the fourteen item Curriculum Emphasis scale (See Table 26). The twelve variable scale assesses the degree to which parents are satisfied with selected curriculum topics. The coefficient alpha of .97 attests to the reliability of this scale (See Table 32). The findings of the correlation matrix show that parents are satisfied (r = .87) with the school's representation of Liberal (AV) and Conservative (AW) Beliefs-Attitudes in the curriculum. Vatican II ideas (BG) and Theory of Evolution (BH) are also equally present in the curriculum to the satisfaction of the parents (r =.83). There are additional moderate correlational associations among the variables of this scale.

In summary, the scales that were formulated proved to be reliable measures for most of the eight constructs. The statistical anomalies often found with the scales that assess demographic characteristics can be rectified by considering demographic variable individually and not as a grouping or scale. Demographic variables can "stand-alone" during statistical analyses that exemplifies their utility as dependent variables (Kerlinger, 1973). Several recommendations for scale revisions or improvement shall be offered in the final section of this paper.

Once the constructs and scales were established, further statistical procedures were conducted. The forthcoming section describes the various purpose and utility of each statistical application employed.

Parent Survey- Construct/Scale Statistical Analyses

The creation of the eight construct/scales effectively streamlined data analysis. The combining or exclusion of variables from the original Parent Survey questions/items significantly reduced the data set from 192 to 143 variables. The grouping of variables by scales aided in managing the data evaluations. The purpose of this section is to outline the various statistical procedures that were used on the nine construct/scales (See Table

8). The actual results of the data analyses are not presented, since these findings are the subject of a series of investigative research studies on various parent/school topics currently in progress.

Initially, descriptive data were recollected using the Frequencies program of SPSSPC+. Measures of central tendencies were derived that aided the research team in determining the distribution and frequency of responses for each variable and, collectively, each of the eight scales. This data run also helped in uncovering data management problems, such as missing values and incompatible response coding among combined variables. Data presentations of demographic variables were mostly obtained from this statistical application.

The eight construct/scales were compared across the five schools under study using the Crosstabs procedure. The two-way crosstabs tables examined the distribution of variable responses within and across each secondary school. The accompanying tests of significance (e.g., Fisher's Chi-square analysis) provided evidence of variance in the frequency of responses for each variable/school interaction. Three-way crosstabs procedures were also performed. In one application, several construct/scales were compared across the four schools (as a two-way analysis), while controlling for parent demographic characteristics. The second procedure crossed the construct/scales with demographic characteristics controlling for the five high schools. The first application permits the study of the effects of each of the demographic characteristics on the construct/scale variables. The second procedure investigates the effects of each of the schools on the construct/scale. Thus, the impact of parent vs. school effects on parental attitudes, involvement, and so on, toward the school can be probed. The three-way crosstabs analysis allows for the investigation of multiple variable interaction effects via joint frequency distributions (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). This procedure is useful in the simultaneous comparison of more than two variables or variable scales.

The field research team was most interested in parent response differences at each of the five schools studied. While the Crosstabs program provided some statistical insight into variable relationships, a more sophisticated and exacting measure, in which several variables could be examined simultaneously, was desired. The statistical method that fulfilled the research needs was Discriminant Analysis. The construct/scales were ideally suited for the discriminant study. Before presenting the procedures used, a brief overview of discriminant analysis is warranted.

Discriminant analysis is useful in the investigation of multivariate research problems. Tatsuoka and Tiedeman (1954) contend that discriminant analysis provides:

1) the establishment of significant group-differences;
2) the study and "explanation" of these differences; and
3) the utilization of multivariate information from the samples studied in classifying a future individual known to belong to one of the groups represented (pp. 413-414).

Discriminant analysis determines the best combination of two or more variables that maximally differentiates existing groups cases or variable categories. The concept underlying discriminant analysis is simple. Linear combinations of independent, often called predictor, variables are statistically formed and serve as the basis for classifying subjects into a particular group being studied (Huberty, 1975). Discriminant analysis provides a measure of group variance or separation by determining the inter-group significant differences of group mean vectors (i.e., group centroids). In determining the group separation, variables (discriminators) are mathematically weighted and combined so that the groups are forced to be as statistically separate as possible from one another when interacting with two or more variables. Estimates of inter-group distances (between centroids) and the degree of the relationship between response variables and group membership can be examined (Huberty, 1975). These estimations are useful in setting up rules of assigning an individual from outside the sample, but within the group population, to one of the predetermined classification by predicting possible group membership.

Discriminant analysis was used to determine the linear impact of the construct/scales on the five high schools. The latter served as the classification groups for the initial discriminant study. The primary use of discriminant analysis in this study was to determine how well the variable scales combined to distinguish the parent groups at the five schools. The research team acknowledges the limitations in the generalization of results from discriminant analyses.[11] Nonetheless, Discriminant Analysis provided data on parent/school differences that supports the purpose and utility of the Parent Survey.

In summary, the statistical procedures performed on the nine construct/scales provide only the inertia for further statistical analyses of the Parent Survey data. As other research hypotheses and questions are posed, other techniques will hopefully be employed to further test the efficacy of the Parent Survey.

Parent Survey- Recommendations and Conclusions

Overall, the Parent Survey provides an extensive analysis of parents' demographics/characteristics and perceptions, attitudes, expectations, involvement and knowledge of their childrens' schools. There are strengths and weaknesses to this survey instrument. To aid prospective users of the Parent Survey, an outline of both bi-polar ratings shall be offered. Please be advised that this listing is neither conclusive nor exhaustive. The strengths and weaknesses of any test or measure should be scrutinized with each administration.

Strengths

1) The Parent Survey provides a comprehensive study of parents' interaction with their childrens' school. The questions/items on the survey are theoretically flexible to allow for alternate

groupings of questions/items for exploration of a particular concept or construct. The eight construct/scales were created, in part, based on the grouping and order of questions/items on the Parent Survey. Theoretically, variables could be combined within scales or scales could even be combined. Statistical studies would have to be conducted to prove the worth of reconstruction. Nonetheless, the Parent Survey contains a large item domain to measure many research queries about parent/school interaction.

2) The eight scales proved to be reliable measures of the related construct. Most of the reliability coefficients obtained were acceptable. Thus, abbreviated forms of the Parent Survey could be issued if only selected constructs are of interest. A researcher can examine the scales (and alpha levels) and select those that provide an accurate measure of intended survey topic. There is tremendous utility in being able to select scales to reduce costs of administration to the researcher and costs of time to potential respondents.

3) The administration and scoring of the Parent Survey is straight-forward. The survey can either be administered in proctered sessions or act as a mail-survey. The design of the survey lends itself to minimal response complications that are often found in narrative surveys or face-to-face interviews (Kerlinger, 1973). The use of dichotomous and continuous response options provide an uncomplicated reporting and scoring format. These response options are compatible with most

statistical procedures that may be performed.

4) The Parent Survey is not restricted to the particular parent population. The survey will most likely produce similar results with a high-income, non-minority parent population. Thus, the Parent Survey has valuable research applications with any Catholic, and with minor modifications to certain questions, other private or public school parent population.
5) The Parent Survey provides a data set for a body of research knowledge that is virtually uncharted. Parents' involvement with their children's schools is an important research topic. The value of parent/school interaction must continue to be studied to stimulate parent interest and provide the schools with guidelines on parent/school interface. Therefore, data collected via the Parent Survey may aid in developing the promoting this type of research.

Limitations

1) The Parent Survey was released without the benefit of a pilot administration. This is usually a serious problem, however, the techniques used to construct the survey (as discussed in an earlier section of this document) salvaged the reliability and validity of this instrument. Nonetheless, pilot studies are valuable exercises to improve not only the survey design, but also administration and scoring procedures.
2) The Parent Survey is a lengthy measure. Even though the survey

return and the missing response rates were acceptable, the eight page, 202 questions/items is still a bit too long. The survey instrument needs to be closely examined to determine if any streamlining can occur. Also, a response style or bias effect may occur with lengthy survey instruments. Briefly, respondents may select or not select items based on criteria independent of the intent of the survey. For example, faking or lying on survey items distorts reportage; also responses using extreme scale points or choosing a random pattern of responses adversely effects survey data credibility (Rorer, 1965). These "sins" may be amplified with long or redundant surveys. Thus, survey designers should be attentive to these response phenomena.

3) The multiple step questions presented a certain degree of difficulty for respondents. The missing response rates are highest for the second and, sometimes, third parts of these questions. Perhaps these items would be better served if considered as single part questions. This may lengthen the survey, but would improve response rate to these items. The value of these items must be examined to determine the merit of this proposal.

4) The five parent samples differ in size which creates certain problems for purposes of statistical analysis. A stratified random sampling technique could have been used in the initial data collection. This would have ensured consistent samples sizes for all four schools. Due to the unequal parent samples,

the row percentages in Crosstabs procedures were uninterpretable. The unequal "n's" may also confound other statistical techniques that may be performed on this particular data set.

5) There are two versions of the Parent Survey. Each was administered at two schools. The second revision resulted mostly in a format change of the questions. However, the last item on Questions 12, 13, 14 were added to the second printing of the Parent Survey. These items provide useful classification data, but should be eliminated from the variable set when performing more advanced statistical analyses.

There are probably many more positive and negative aspects of the Parent Survey. However, the purpose of this document is to provide the "road-map" that was used to develop and implement the Parent Survey. Survey and data analyses are still on-going. However, there are several recommendations that can be offered at this stage of the evolution of the Parent Survey.

1) The survey should be shortened to expedite completion time for respondents and reduce the amount of data entry services needed.
2) The multiple step questions should not be dropped. However, the instructions for these types of questions should be in different colors to elicit the attention of the respondent. For example, step one instructions could be printed in black, step two in red and step three in green. This would visually cue the respondent to acknowledge the instructions for the steps two or three. The missing response rate for this type of question

should improve with this survey "gadget."

3) One form of the Parent Survey must be chosen and endorsed by the field research team. The items added to several of the questions creates a multitude of statistical problems during analyses. For the sake of convenience, these items should be deleted from any analyses involving the current data set of the Parent Survey.

4) The Parent Survey should be re-administered to a similar parent population to establish the test-retest performance of the instrument. This would not only aid in legitimizing the reliability of the instrument, but also provide a measure of response comparison to ensure that deviations among variables is not due to measurement error.

5) The survey should be re-formatted to accommodate entry of data via light (or laser) reading techniques. The manual recording of surveys for a large sample (e.g., 1070 respondents) is tedious and a potential source of error. Either the survey directly needs to be revised or a separate score sheet for the survey needs to developed for automated data entry.

In closing, the Parent Survey is worthy of further investigation and improvement. The data collected by the instrument is of significant research value to not only educational researchers, but also to other social scientists. Thus, the final recommendation is to continue investing research time and efforts to improve the design, application and statistical performance of the Parent Survey.

Footnotes

[1] See F.N. Kerlinger (1973). Foundations of behavioral Research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Chapter 24 (pp. 410-426), for a detailed discussion on survey research.

[2] See Overman, B.C. (1979). A study of schooling: Methodology (Technical Report No. 2). Los Angeles: University of California.

[3] See Dornbusch, S.M., et al (1984) Family compositions. Stanford: Stanford Center for the Study of Youth Development, on the effect of single parenting and extended households on students in-school performances.

[4] See United States Bureau of Census (1980). Statistical abstract of the United States (95th ed.). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, for detailed analysis of indices of socio-economic status.

[5] See Department of Public Welfare (1985). Guidelines for income maintenance. Harrisburg: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for further discussion on this topic.

[6] See Seginer, R (1983). Parents' educational expectations and children's academic achievement: A literature review. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 29, 1-23, for comprehensive review of research on the effects of parents expectations.

[7] See Bauch, P.A. (1985). Parent involvement: Exploring roles for parents in curriculum and school improvement. Paper presented at the National Catholic Educational Association, St. Louis, MO., for comprehensive review of parent involvement literature.

[8] See Bauch, P.A., & Small, T.W. (1986). Parents' reasons for school choice in four inner-city Catholic high schools: Their relationship to education, income, child aspirations, religion, and race. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, for data analysis of parents' reasons for school choice.

[9] See Buck, M.R., & Austrin, H.R. (1970). Factors affecting the socioeconomically disadvantaged child in an educational setting (Project No. 9-5-034). St. Louis, MO: St Louis Public School System. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service) for topic discussion and comprehensive literature review.

[10] This section of the paper is devoted to a description of the statistical techniques performed on the Parent Survey data and the rationale for using such procedures. The purpose is not to present or interpret the results obtained as a result of the application of the statistical techniques. The research team, as well as other researchers, will present data findings in separate publications.

[11] See Tatsuoka, M.M. (1971). Multivariate analysis. New York: Wiley, for an indepth review of the limitations and applications of discriminant analysis.

References

Anoble, R.J. (1983). Survey Research. New York: Simmons.

Bauch, P.A. (1985). Parent involvement: Exploring roles for parents in curriculum and school improvement. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Catholic Educational Association, St. Louis, MO.

Bauch, P.A., Blum, I., Taylor, N., & Valli, L. (1985). Methodology used to conduct a field study of five Catholic secondary schools serving low-income families. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, Center for the Study of Youth Development.

Bauch, P.A., & Small, T.W. (1986). Parents' reasons for school choice in four inner-city Catholic high schools: Their relationship to education, income, child aspirations, religion, and race. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Boocock, S.S. (1985). Sociology of education: An introduction (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Bryk, A.S., & Holland, P.B. (1984). Effective Catholic schools: An exploration. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association.

Cibulka, J.G., O'Brien, T.J., Zewe, D. (1982). Inner-city private elementary schools: A study. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

Clark, R.M. (1983). Family life and school achievement: Why poor black children succeed or fail. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D., & York, R.L. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education.

Coleman, J.S., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. (1982). High school achievement. New York: Basic Books.

Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.

Entwisle, D.R., & Hayduk, L.A. (1978). Too great expectations: The academic outlook of young children. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gallup, H.G. (Ed.).(1983). The gallup poll: Public opinion. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources,Inc.

Gallup, H.G., & Rogers, C.H. (1984). Survey, polls, and public opinion. Wilmington: Scholarly

Gigliotti, R.J., & Brookover, W.R. (1975). The learning environment: A comparison of high and low achieving elementary schools. Urban Education, 10, 245-261.

Glass, G.V., & Stanley, J.C. (1970). Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Glass, G.V., & Hopkins, K.D. (1984). Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greeley, A.M. (1982). Catholic high schools and minority students New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Huberty, C.J. (1975). Discriminant analysis. Review of Educational Research, 45, 543-598.

Jencks, C., Smith M., Acland, H., Bane, M.J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kidder, L.H. (1981). Research methods in social relations (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kuklinski, D.M. (1984). Behavioral implications of interpersonal Mechanisms. New York: Scribners.

Marjoribanks, K. (1979). Families and their learning environments: An empirical analysis. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul.

National Catholic Educational Association (1983). A national portrait of Catholic secondary schools: Survey. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association.

National Catholic Educational Association (1985). The Catholic high school: A national portrait. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association.

National Catholic Educational Association (1986). Catholic high schools: Their impact on low-income students. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.H. (1985). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Norusis, M.J. (1986). SPSSPC+: For the IBM PC/XT/AT. Chicago: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Nunnally, J.C. (1978). Psychometric Theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Overman, B.C. (1979). A study of schooling: Methodology (Technical Report No. 2). Los Angeles: University of California.

Pugh, M.D. (1976). Statistical assumptions and social reality: A critical analysis of achievement models. Sociology of Education, 49, 34-40.

Robinson, J.P., & Shaver, P.R. (1969). Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute of for Social Research.

Rorer, L.G. (1965). The great response-style myth. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 129-156.

Rosenberg, M. (1968). The logic of survey analysis. New York: Basic Books.

Seginer, R. (1983). Parents' educational expectations and children's academic achievements: A literature review. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 29, 1-23.

Sirotnik, K.A. (1979). Development and psychometric analyses of major scales utilized in a study of schooling (Technical Report No. 4). Los Angeles: University of California.

St. John, N. (1972). Mothers and children: Congruence and optimism of school-related attitudes. Journal of Marriage and Family, 34, 422-430.

Tatsuoka, M.M., & Tiedeman, D.V. (1954). Discriminant analysis. Review of Educational Research, 24, 402-420.

Woelfel, J. & Haller, A.O. (1971). Significant others, the self-reflexive act and the attitude formation process. American Sociological Review, 36, 74-87.

Wexler, P. (1976). The sociology of education: Beyond equality. Indianapolis: Boobs Merrill.

Table 1

Survey Models Used to Develop the Parent Survey

Parent Survey Question*	Survey Model Reference Information
Part I	
1	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey-Question 1
2	Generated by CUA Research Team
3	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey-Question 2
4	Generated by CUA Research Team
5	Generated by CUA Research Team
6	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey-Question 3
Part II	
1	Generated by CUA Research Team
2	Generated by CUA Research Team
3	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey-Question 6
4	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey-Questions 14,16
5	NCEA Principal Survey - Question 10.5 Modified by CUA Research Team
6	Generated by CUA Research Team
7	Generated by CUA Research Team
8	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey-Question 17
9 (1) a-z 9 (2) a-z	Generated by CUA Research Team

Parent Survey Question	Survey Model Reference Information
Part II	
10 (1) a-m 10 (2) a-m 10 (3) a-m	NCEA Principal Survey- Questions 1.38, 10.11- 10.14 A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Question 26 Modified by CUA Research Team
11 (1) a-n 11 (2) a-n	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Question 18 NCEA Principal Survey- Question 14 Modified by CUA Research Team
12 (1) a-p 12 (2) a-p	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Question 13 NCEA Principal Survey- Question 10.9 Modified by CUA Research Team
13 (1) a-l 13 (2) a-l	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Questions 20, 23 NCEA Principal Survey- Question 10.3 Modified by CUA Research Team
14 a-g	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Question 22 Modified by CUA Research Team
15 (1) a-s 15 (2) a-s	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Question 24 NCEA Principal Survey- Question 7.18, 14 Modified by CUA Research Team
Part III	
16	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Question 30
17	Generated by CUA Research Team
18	Generated by CUA Research Team
19	NCEA Principal Survey- Questions 3.17- 3.20 Modified by CUA Research Team

Parent Survey Question	Model Survey Reference Information
Part III	
20	Generated by CUA Research Team
21	Generated by CUA Research Team
22	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Question 28 NCEA Principal Survey- Question 3.26
23	NCEA Principal Survey- Questions 3.7- 3.9
24	NCEA Principal Survey- Question 3.27
25	Generated by CUA Research Team
26	Generated by CUA Research Team
27	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Question 31
28	A Study of Schooling Parent Survey- Question 32
29	Generated by CUA Research Team
30	Generated by CUA Research Team
31	Generated by CUA Research Team

---

*Please refer to Appendix A for the Parent Survey reference document

Table 2

Reliability Measures of Survey Models Used in the Construction of the Parent Survey

Survey Models Constructs Measured	Questions/Items	Alpha Level
A Study of Schooling* Parent Survey Demographics	1 - 6 27 - 32	.34*
A Study of Schooling Parent Survey School Goals	7 - 10	.823
A Study of Schooling Parent Survey Satisfaction with School	12	.861
A Study of Schooling Parent Survey Decision Making	13	.776
A Study of Schooling Parent Survey Communication	14	.802
A Study of Schooling Parent Survey Participation	20	.831
A Study of Schooling Parent Survey Reasons for Non-Participation	22	.784
A Study of Schooling Parent Survey School Problems	24	.814

Survey Model Constructs Measured	Questions/Items	Alpha Level
NCEA Principal Survey** School Goals	10.11	.802
NCEA Principal Survey Parent Involvement	10.3	.783
NCEA Principal Survey School Problems	7.18	.812

[*] Source: Overman (1979); Sirotnik (1979)

[**] Source: NCEA (1985)

Table 3
School Demographic Characteristics

	Schools				
	Black Schools				
	Boys	Girls	Co-ed	Hispanic Girls	White Working-Class Boys
Location	East	West	Midwest	East	Mid-Atlantic
Governance Structure	Religious Order Owned & Operated	Diocesan Owned/Religious Order Operated	Diocesan Owned and Operated	Diocesan Owned/ Religious Order Operated	Diocesan Owned and Operated
Enrollment (Approximate)	780	325	300	1000	275
Gender Composition	Boys	Girls	Mixed (Girls 62%; Boys 38%)	Girls	Boys
Tuition	$1,200	$925	$1,125	$1,200	$1,500
% College-Going 1985	79	40	97	58	90
Family Characteristics					
Race	N= 437	N= 136	N= 187	N= 136	N= 174
% Black	34	80	98	27	94
% Hispanic	57	19	1	7	3
% Non-Catholic	25	53	57	21	56
Median Family Income 1985	$16,101	$22,737	$24,500	$16,617	$17,500
% Below $10,000	46	29	15	36	16
% Betw $20-30,000	14	22	25	21	25
% Above $30,000	9	6	27	11	37

*Source: Direct reporting by schools during 1985 field study

Table 4

Parent Sample by the Five Schools

	Schools					
	Black Schools					
	Boys	Girls	Coed	Hispanic Girls	White Working-Class Boys	Totals
Survey Information						
No. Distributed	225	294	261	718	204	1702
No. Returned	174	187	136	437	136	1070
Return Rate	77%	64%	52%	61%	67%	63%
Responders						
Mother	138 (79%)	138 (74%)	114 (83%)	322 (73%)	102 (75%)	814 (76%)
Father	20 (12%)	25 (13%)	16 (12%)	68 (16%)	21 (15%)	150 (14%)
Other[*]	14 (8%)	16 (9%)	2 (2%)	20 (5%)	9 (7%)	61 (6%)
No Response	2 (1%)	8 (4%)	4 (3%)	27 (6%)	4 (3%)	45 (4%)
Total	174 (100%)	187 (100%)	136 (100%)	437 (100%)	136 (100%)	1070 (100%)

[*] Other = relative or foster parent

Table 5

Parent Survey Response Coding Scheme

Parent Survey Question*	Response Options and Coding Schemes
Part I	
1	Respondent enters actual number
2	Respondent enters actual number
3	Mother = 1 Father = 2 Other = 3
4	Yes = 2 No = 1
5	Respondent enters actual number
6	Respondent enters actual number
Part II	
1	Drop out of school before getting a high school diploma = 1 Graduate from high school and get no more education after that = 2 Go to trade, business, or vocational school for a year or two after high school = 3 Go to college for one or two years = 4 Get a college degree = 5 Get past college and get a Master's degree=6 Get an advanced degree after college (Ph.D., M.D., or law degree) = 7
2	Very Important = 3 Somewhat Important = 2 Not Important at All = 1
3	A Great Deal = 3 A Moderate Amount = 2 Very Little = 1

Parent Survey Question	Response Options and Coding Schemes
Part II	
4	None = 1 1-2 = 2 3-5 = 3 6-10 = 4 10 or more times = 5
5	Respondents enter actual numbers
6	None = 1 1-2 = 2 3-5 = 3 6-10 = 4 10 or more times = 5
7	Parents = 1 Teachers = 2 Guidance Counselors = 3 Administrators = 4
8	The school usually responds quickly = 1 The school responds, but after some delay = 2 The school usually doesn't respond at all = 3 I never had to contact the school = 4
9 (1) a-z	Very Important = 3 Somewhat Important = 2 Not at all Important = 1
9 (2) a-z	Respondents select one of the items: a-z
10 (1) a-m	Very Important = 4 Somewhat Important = 3 Somewhat Unimportant = 2 Not at all Important = 1
10 (2) a-m	Respondents select one of the items: a-m
10 (3) a-m	Respondents select one of the items: a-m
11 (1) a-n	Yes = 3 No = 2 I don't know = 1
11 (2) a-n	Too Much = 4 About Right = 3 Too Little = 2 I don't know = 1

Parent Survey Questions	Response Options and Coding Schemes
Part II	
12 (1) a-p	Yes = 2 No = 1
12 (2) a-p	Yes = 2 No = 1
13 (1) a-l	Very Important = 3 Somewhat Important = 2 Not at all Important = 1
13 (2) a-l	Yes = 2 No = 1
14 a-l	Yes = 2 No = 1
15 (1) a-s	Not a Problem = 3 Minor Problem = 2 Major Problem = 1
15 (2) a-s	Respondents selects one of the items: a-s
Part III	
16	Completed eighth grade or less = 1 Had some high school, but didn't finish = 2 Completed high school = 3 Completed technical, vocation, trade, or business school = 4 Had some college, but didn't finish = 5 Graduated from a two-year college = 6 Graduated from a 4-year college or university = 7 Completed a post-graduate or professional degree = 8
17	Very satisfied = 4 Somewhat satisfied = 3 Somewhat dissatisfied = 2 Very dissatisfied = 1

Parent Survey Questions	Response Options and Coding Schemes
Part III	
18	Respondents enter actual numbers
19	None = 1 Partial School Scholarship = 2 Sponsorship of a relative = 4 Sponsorship of a patron not a relative = 5 Other = 6
20	None = 1 1-5 = 2 6-10 = 3 11=20 = 4 21 or more hours = 5
21	None = 1 Partial tuition = 2 Full tuition = 3 Books, supplies = 4 Transportation = 5 Clothing = 6 Entertainment = 7
22	Less than $5,000 = 1 $5,001-$10,000 = 2 $10,001-$15,000 = 3 $15,001-$20,000 = 4 $20,001-$30,000 = 5 $30,001-$50,000 = 6 $50,001-$100,000 = 7 Over $100,000 = 8
23	White/Caucasian/Anglo = 1 Black/Negro/Afro-American = 2 Oriental/Asian American = 3 Mexican American/Mexican/Chicano = 4 Cuban/Puerto Rican/Other Latin American = 5 American Indian = 6 Other = 7

Parent Survey Questions	Response Options and Coding Schemes
Part III	
24	Owner-occupied house, condominium, or townhouse = 1 Single or duplex rental = 2 Multiple unit rental = 3 Government-subsidized housing = 4 Other = 5
25-26	Full-time = 1 Part-time = 2 Not at all = 3
27-28	Strongly conservative = 1 Conservative = 2 Moderate = 3 Liberal = 4 Strongly liberal = 5
29	Yes = 2 No = 1
30-31	Weekly = 1 Monthly = 2 A few times a year = 3 Not at all = 4

---

*Please refer to Appendix A for the Parent Survey reference document

Table 6

Parent Survey Missing Response Data

Parent Survey Questions*	Maximum Number of Responses	Number of Missing Responses	Missing Response Rates
Part I			
1	1070	13	1%
2	1070	47	4%
3	1070	43	4%
4	1070	30	3%
5	1070	23	2%
6	1070	58	5%
Part II			
1	1070	18	2%
2	1070	13	1%
3	1070	15	1%
4	1070	17	2%
5	1070	492	46%
6	1070	13	1%
7	1070	126	12%
8	1070	28	3%
9 (1) a-z	26,750	697	3%
9 (2) a-z	1070	138	13%
10 (1) a-m	13,910	257	2%
10 (2) a-m	1070	221	21%

Parent Survey Questions	Maximum Number of Responses	Number of Missing Responses	Missing Response Rates
Part II			
10 (3) a-m	1070	187	17%
11 (1) a-n	14,980	770	5%
11 (1) a-n	14,980	949	6%
12 (1) a-p**	16,496	518	3%
12 (2) a-p**	16,496	1,498	9%
13 (1) a-l**	12,216	535	4%
13 (2) a-l**	12,216	1,129	9%
14 a-f**	6420	299	5%
15 (1) a-s	20,330	789	4%
15 (2) a-s	1070	236	22%
Part III			
16	1070	21	2%
17	1070	44	4%
18	1070	210	20%
19	1070	54	5%
20	1070	28	3%
21	1070	48	5%
22	1070	90	8%
23	1070	29	3%
24	1070	33	3%
25	1070	40	4%
26	1070	132	12%

Parent Survey Questions	Maximum Number of Responses	Number of Missing Responses	Missing Response Rates
Part III			
27	1070	91	9%
28	1070	64	6%
29	1070	18	2%
30	655	15	2%
31	388	32	8%

---

[*] Please refer to Appendix A for the Parent Survey reference document

[**] Numbers represent the actual responses, adjusting for the differences in the two Parent Survey editions

Table 7

Chronology of Statistical Analyses for Parent Survey*

Statistical Applications	Unit of Measurement
Frequency Distributions	All 192 survey questions/items
1) Measures of Central Tendencies	
Crosstabs Tables	All 192 survey questions/items by the four secondary schools
1) Joint Frequency Distributions	
2) Significance Tests	
Frequency Distributions	
1) Measures of Central Tendencies	The eight constructs/scales-143 variables
Crosstabs Tables	The nine constructs/scales-143 variables by the four
1) Joint Frequency Distributions	
2) Significance Tests	The constructs/scales of Individual Factors & Family Factors by: Parent Expectations for Child Parent Expectations for School Parent Perceptions of School Parent Involvement at School Parent Knowledge of School
Discriminant Analysis	The nine constructs/scales-143 variables
1) Discriminant Functions	
2) Group Centroids (mean vectors)	
3) Canonical Correlations	
4) Additional Significance Tests	

---

*Statistical Analyses as of April, 1986

Table 8

Parent Survey Constructs and Scales

Constructs/Scales	Subscales
I. Individual Factors	None
II. Family Factors	None
III. Parent Expectations of School	School Goals- Importance and Priority Goals
	Reason for Choosing School-Importance and Priority Reason
IV. Parent Perceptions of School	School Goals- Most Emphasized Goal
	School Problems-Biggest Problem
	School Curriculum Characteristics
V. Parent Involvement in School	Participation
	Decision Making
	Communication
	Reasons for Non-Participation
VI. Parent School and Curriculum Knowledge	General School Knowledge
	Curriculum Knowledge- General Characteristics
	Curriculum Emphasis

Constructs/Scales	Subscales
VII. Parent Attitudes Towards School	Importance of Participation at School
	Parent Wants to Make Decisions
	Important to Know School
VIII. Parent Satisfaction with School	None

Table 9

Construction of the Constructs/Scales

Parent Survey Questions/Items*	Constructs/Scales Variables	Constructs/Scales Variables Definitions
	Construct/Scale- Individual Factors	
Part I - 3	C	Responder
Part III - 27	FL	Political Beliefs- Other Parents
Part III - 28	FM	Political Beliefs- Own
Part III - 29	FN	Religion- Catholic
Part III - 30	FO	Religion- Catholic Church Participation
Part III - 31	FP	Religion- Non-Catholic Church Participation
Part III - 16	ES	Socio-Economic Status- Educational Attainment
III - 22	FG	Socio-economic Status- Income
III - 23	FH	Socio-economic Status- Ethnicity
III - 24	FI	Socio-economic Status- Housing
Part III - 17	ET	Schooling Experience- Satisfaction with Educational Attainment
Part III - 18	EU	Catholic Schooling- Elementary
Part III - 18	EV	Catholic Schooling- High School

Parent Survey Questions/Items	Constructs/Scales Variables	Constructs/Scales Variables Definitions
Construct/Scale- Family Factors		
Part I - 1	A	Children Attending this School
Part I - 2	B	Children Attended this School
Part I - 6	F	Home Conditions- Children at Home
Part I - 5,6	E	Home Conditions- Crowding at Home
III - 25, 26	FJ	Home Conditions-Parents Working
III - 20	EX	Home Conditions- Child Working
I - 4	D	Home Conditions- Parent Absent
III - 19	EW	Financial Aid- Source of Aid
III - 20, 21	EZ	Financial Aid- Contribution to Schooling- A
III - 20, 21	FC	Financial Aid- Child's Contribution to Schooling- B
II - 1	G	Parent Expectations for Child's Educational Attainment
Construct/Scale- Parent Expectations of School		
Subscale- School Goals		
II - 10 (1) g, k	XX	School Goals- Intellectual
II - 10 (1) a,c,i,j,m	RR	School Goals- Social/Community
II - 10 (1) b,d,e,f	SS	School Goals- Personal/Religious
II - 10 (1) h,l	YY	School Goals- Vocational/Survival
II- 10 (2)	AF	School Goals- Priority

Parent Survey Questions/Items	Constructs/Scales Variables	Constructs/Scales Variables Definitions
		Construct/Scale- Parent Expectations of School
		Subscale- Reasons for Choosing School- Importance
II - 9 (1) a,c,i,l,r,t,u	Q	Academic/Curriculum
II - 9 (1) f,o,p,q,w,x,y	V	Religion/Values
II - 9 (1) s	II	Discipline
II - 9 (1) b,m	R	Child's Choice
II - 9 (1) e,g,j,k,n,v	Z	Convenience/Safety
II - 9 (1) h	X	Affordable Tuition
II - 9 (1) d	T	Athletics
II - 9 (2)	QQ	Reasons for Choosing School-Priority

Parent Survey Questions/Items	Constructs/Scales Variables	Constructs/Scales Variables Definitions
Construct/Scale- Parent Perceptions of School		
Subscale- School Goal Most Emphasized		
II - 10 (3)	AG	Goal School Most Emphasizes
Subscale- School Problems		
II - 15 (1) b,e,i	DY	Curriculum/Teachers
II - 15 (1) c,j,n	EA	Finances
II - 15 (1) q,r	EO	Student Body Composition
II - 15 (1) a,d	DX	Moral/Ethical Behavior
II - 15 (1) f,g,h	EC	School Conditions
II - 15 (1) m,s	EK	School Policy
II - 15 (1) l,k,o,p	EJ	Poor Attitude/Lack of Interest
Subscale- School Curriculum- Characteristics**		
II - 11 (1) a,c	AH	Liberal/Modern Beliefs-Attitudes
II - 11 (1) b,d	AI	Conservative/Traditional Beliefs-Attitudes
II - 11 (1) e	AL	Sex Education
II - 11 (1) f	AM	Homework
II - 11 (1) g	AN	Discipline
II - 11 (1) h	AO	Ethnic Curriculum
II - 11 (1) i	AP	Religion
II - 11 (1) j	AQ	Students Express Personal Feelings
II - 11 (1) k	AR	Vatican II Ideas

Parent Survey Questions/Items	Constructs/Scales Variables	Constructs/Scales Variables Definitions
Construct/Scale- Parent Perceptions of School		
Subscale- School Curriculum Characteristics		
II - 11 (1) l	AS	Theory of Evolution
II - 11 (1) m	AT	Helping the Poor
II - 11 (1) n	AU	Social Justice Issues
Construct/Scale- Parent Involvement in School Related Activities		
Subscale- Participation		
II - 13 (2) i,j,l	DM	Participators- Helpers
II - 13 (2) k	DO	Participators- Homework Monitors
II - 13 (2) d,f,g,h	DH	Participators- Attenders
II - 13 (2) c	DG	Participators- Board Members
II - 13 (2) a,b,e	DE	Participators- Teachers and Aides
Subscale- Decision Making		
II - 12 (1) c,e,f,g,j,k	BM	Decision Makers- Curriculum
II - 12 (1) d,n,o	BN	Decision Makers- Finances
II - 12 (1) a,h	BK	Decision Makers- Personnel
II - 12 (1) b,m	BL	Decision Makers- School Policy
II - 12 (1) l	BV	Decision Makers- School Goals
II - 12 (1) i	BS	Decision Makers- Home/School Relations

Parent Survey Questions/Items	Constructs/Scales Variables	Constructs/Scales Variables Definitions
Construct/Scale- Parent Involvement in School Related Activities		
	Subscale- Communication	
II - 4	J	Communicators- Talks with Teachers
II - 5	K	Communicators- Setting for Talks-Telephone
II - 5	L	Communicators- Setting for Talks- Parent Meetings
II - 5	M	Communicators- Setting for Talks- Parent-Teacher Conferences
II - 6	N	Communicators- Setting for Talks- Home
II - 7	O	Responsiveness- Parent usually initiates talks
II - 8	P	Responsiveness- School Response to Parents
	Subscale- Reasons for Non-Participation	
II - 14 a	DQ	Child Care
II - 14 b	DR	Transportation
II - 14 d	DT	Working Hours
II - 14 c,f	DS	Attitude-Language Differences
II - 14 e	DU	Delegation of Responsibilities

Parent Survey Questions/Items	Constructs/Scales Variables	Constructs/Scales Variables Definitions
Construct/Scale- Parent Knowledge of School		
Subscale- General School Knowledge & Curriculum Knowledge- General Characteristics**		
II - 3	I	General School Knowledge
II - 11 (1) a,c	AH	Liberal/Modern Beliefs- Attitudes
II - 11 (1) b,d	AI	Conservative/Traditional Beliefs- Attitudes
II - 11 (1) e	AL	Sex Education
II - 11 (1) f	AM	Homework
II - 11 (1) g	AN	Discipline
II - 11 (1) h	AO	Ethnic Curriculum
II - 11 (1) i	AP	Religion is Taught
II - 11 (1) j	AQ	Students Express Personal Feelings
II - 11 (1) k	AR	Vatican II Ideas
II - 11 (1) l	AS	Theory of Evolution
II - 11 (1) m	AT	Helping the Poor
II - 11 (1) n	AU	Social Justice Issues
Subscale- Curriculum Emphasis**		
II - 11 (2) a,c	AV	Liberal/Modern Beliefs- Attitudes
II - 11 (2) b,d	AW	Conservative/Traditional Beliefs-Attitudes
II - 11 (2) e	AZ	Sex Education
II - 11 (2) f	BA	Homework

Parent Survey Questions/Items	Constructs/Scales Variables	Constructs/Scales Variables Definitions
Construct/Scale- Parent Knowledge of School		
Subscale- Curriculum Emphasis		
II - 11 (2) g	BC	Discipline
II - 11 (2) h	BD	Ethnic Curriculum
II - 11 (2) i	BE	Religion is Taught
II - 11 (2) j	BF	Students Express Personal Feelings
II - 11 (2) k	BG	Vatican II Ideas
II - 11 (2) l	BH	Theory of Evolution
II - 11 (2) m	BI	Helping the Poor
II - 11 (2) n	BJ	Social Justice Issues
Construct/Scale- Parent Attitudes Towards School		
Subscale- Importance of Participation at School		
II - 13 (1) i,j,l	CZ	Helpers
II - 13 (1) k	DB	Homework Monitors
II - 13 (1) d,f,g,h	CU	Attenders
II - 13 (1) c	CT	Board Members
II - 13 (1) a,b,e	CR	Teachers & Aides

Parent Survey Questions/Items	Constructs/Scales Variables	Constructs/Scales Variables Definitions
Subscale- Wants to Make Decisions Important to Know School		
II - 12 (2) c,e,f,g,j,k	CD	Curriculum
II - 12 (2) d,n,o	CE	Finances
II - 12 (2) a,h	CA	Personnel
II - 12 (2) b,m	CB	School Policy
II - 12 (2) l	CM	School Goals
II - 12 (2) p	CQ	Maintenance
II - 12 (2) i	CJ	Home-School Relations
II - 2	H	Important to Know School
Construct/Scale- Parent Satisfaction with School**		
II - 11 (2) a,c	AV	Liberal/Modern Beliefs- Attitudes
II - 11 (2) b,d	AW	Conservative/Traditional Beliefs- Attitudes
II - 11 (2) e	AZ	Sex Education
II - 11 (2) f	BA	Homework
II - 11 (2) g	BC	Discipline
II - 11 (2) h	BD	Ethnic Curriculum
II - 11 (2) i	BE	Religion
II - 11 (2) j	BF	Students Express Personal Feelings
II - 11 (2) k	BG	Vatican II Ideas
II - 11 (2) l	BH	Theory of Evolution
II - 11 (2) m	BI	Helping the Poor
II - 11 (2) n	BJ	Social Justice Issues

---

[*] Please refer to Appendix A for the Parent Survey reference document

[**] Constructs/Scales that utilize the same questions/items are differentiated via evaluation of response options

Table 10

Reliability Analysis: School Goals-Original Items

```
 1.     RR          Impt goal- Building community among faculty
 2.     SS          Impt goal- Developing appreciation for the arts
 3.     TT          Impt goal- Developing high moral standards & citizenship
 4.     UU          Impt goal- Developing individual responsibility for learning
 5.     VV          Impt goal- Developing understanding of Catholic church
 6.     WW          Impt goal- Fostering spiritual development
 7.     XX          Impt gc   - Preparing students for college
 8.     YY          Impt goal- Preparing students for labor market
 9.     ZZ          Impt goal- Promoting understanding & commitment to justice
10.     AB          Impt goal- Promoting understanding & commitment to peace
11.     AC          Impt goal- Teaching basic skills
12.     AD          Impt goal- Teaching life skills
13.     AE          Impt goal- Teaching students how to get along with others

                 CORRELATION MATRIX
           RR         SS         TT         UU         VV         WW         XX         YY         ZZ         AB
RR       1.0000
SS        .6503     1.0000
TT        .5077      .5082     1.0000
UU        .5691      .5718      .6097     1.0000
VV        .5242      .4982      .4392      .5253     1.0000
WW        .5927      .5565      .5628      .5598      .6767     1.0000
XX        .4821      .4550      .3929      .5465      .3939      .4719     1.0000
YY        .5430      .5615      .4747      .4825      .4366      .5623      .4719     1.0000
ZZ        .6026      .5979      .6166      .6055      .5664      .6773      .5068      .6258     1.0000
AB        .5240      .5085      .4251      .4963      .4837      .5399      .3914      .4554      .6499     1.0000
AC        .4285      .4139      .3567      .5127      .3859      .4307      .5265      .4645      .4863      .6733
AD        .4496      .4223      .4898      .5132      .4181      .4869      .3922      .4518      .5141      .6225
AE        .4876      .4277      .4476      .4846      .3964      .4485      .4115      .4399      .5104      .6608

           AC         AD         AE
AC       1.0000
AD        .6376     1.0000
AE        .6631      .6932     1.0000

      # OF CASES =            1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

            SCALE        SCALE      CORRECTED
            MEAN        VARIANCE      ITEM-       SQUARED        ALPHA
           IF ITEM      IF ITEM       TOTAL       MULTIPLE      IF ITEM
           DELETED      DELETED    CORRELATION  CORRELATION     DELETED

RR         44.2467      73.1084      .7195        .5605         .9230
SS         44.7178      72.4086      .6955        .5434         .9242
TT         43.9738      77.2491      .6526        .5174         .9256
UU         43.9047      76.0115      .7241        .5772         .9234
VV         44.4280      72.7670      .6458        .5093         .9265
WW         44.2972      72.0276      .7467        .6317         .9220
XX         43.8692      79.2588      .6016        .4435         .9274
YY         44.3458      73.1413      .6683        .4999         .9252
ZZ         44.2037      72.7311      .7910        .6791         .9204
AB         44.1439      74.1476      .7202        .6568         .9230
AC         43.8364      77.2557      .6587        .6287         .9254
AD         43.9000      75.7814      .6736        .5873         .9247
AE         43.9794      75.2662      .6693        .6081         .9248

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     13 ITEMS
ALPHA =    .9297             STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9321
```

Table 11

Reliability Analysis: School Goals- Construct Subscale

1. XX School Goals- Intellectual
2. RR School Goals- Social/Community
3. SS School Goals- Personal/Religious
4. YY School Goals- Vocational/Survival

CORRELATION MATRIX

	XX	RR	SS	YY
XX	1.0000			
RR	.6414	1.0000		
SS	.5326	.6417	1.0000	
YY	.6902	.7328	.5825	1.0000

OF CASES = 1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

	SCALE MEAN IF ITEM DELETED	SCALE VARIANCE IF ITEM DELETED	CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATION	ALPHA IF ITEM DELETED
XX	11.7804	6.5832	.7091	.5243	.8492
RR	11.8206	5.4888	.7865	.6243	.8127
SS	11.9888	5.9400	.6608	.4485	.8650
YY	11.9449	5.5133	.7753	.6273	.8175

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS 4 ITEMS

ALPHA = .8727 STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA = .8752

Table 12
Reliability Analysis: Reasons for School Choice- Original Items

1.	Q	How impt- Academic reputation
2.	R	How impt- Child's friend attends
3.	S	How impt- Teachers
4.	T	How impt- Athletics
5.	U	How impt- Location
6.	V	How impt- Religious
7.	W	How impt- Buildings/facilities
8.	X	How impt- Affordable tuition
9.	Y	How impt- College prep
10.	Z	How impt- Older bro/sis attended
11.	AA	How impt- Parents/relatives attended
12.	BB	How impt- Special training-courses
13.	CC	How impt- Child wanted to attend
14.	DD	How impt- Available public school unsafe
15.	EE	How impt- School open to parent ideas
16.	FF	How impt- Religious education
17.	GG	How impt- Moral training
18.	HH	How impt- Helps students with learning problems
19.	II	How impt- Discipline
20.	JJ	How impt- Class size
21.	KK	How impt- Public school curriculum poor or limited
22.	LL	How impt- Availability of transportation
23.	MM	How impt- Willingness to address social and moral issues
24.	NN	How impt- Positive influence on child
25.	OO	How impt- Shares my values & beliefs

CORRELATION MATRIX

	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
Q	1.0000									
R	.5634	1.0000								
S	.6389	.6967	1.0000							
T	.5762	.7501	.7355	1.0000						
U	.5255	.5945	.6224	.6488	1.0000					
V	.5848	.6605	.7009	.6820	.6127	1.0000				
W	.5792	.6916	.7343	.7076	.6615	.6987	1.0000			
X	.5868	.6129	.6321	.6570	.6037	.6446	.6868	1.0000		
Y	.6101	.6574	.7238	.6510	.6031	.6645	.7057	.6930	1.0000	
Z	.4917	.6571	.6097	.6150	.5616	.5845	.6714	.5766	.6216	1.0000
AA	.4733	.6528	.6203	.6371	.5492	.5811	.6601	.5874	.6034	.8461
BB	.5461	.6399	.6795	.6551	.5694	.6243	.7416	.6148	.6693	.6903
CC	.5073	.5689	.5876	.5942	.5454	.5749	.6288	.5952	.6117	.6062
DD	.4596	.5749	.6089	.5607	.5520	.5918	.6535	.5829	.6149	.6279
EE	.5865	.5889	.6890	.6426	.5602	.6488	.6837	.6565	.6667	.5890
FF	.6084	.5967	.6252	.5943	.5665	.7121	.6360	.6432	.6700	.6074
GG	.5792	.5550	.6368	.5740	.5482	.6322	.6150	.6105	.6813	.6043
HH	.5797	.6015	.6542	.6109	.5206	.6028	.6631	.6187	.6710	.5982
II	.2607	.2609	.3564	.3052	.2926	.3331	.3505	.3690	.3288	.3407
JJ	.2373	.3018	.3964	.3450	.2858	.3358	.3492	.3703	.3559	.3150
KK	.1844	.2748	.3275	.3029	.2972	.3376	.3881	.2708	.2915	.3740
LL	.2256	.3817	.3857	.4082	.4160	.3709	.4928	.4108	.3349	.4762
MM	.2869	.4141	.4428	.4121	.3385	.4564	.5245	.4074	.4163	.4301
NN	.2741	.3706	.4146	.3867	.3914	.3818	.4543	.4260	.4241	.4557
OO	.3361	.3718	.4227	.3531	.2760	.4441	.4258	.4081	.4112	.3663

	AA	BB	CC	DD	EE	FF	GG	HH	II	JJ
AA	1.0000									
BB	.6988	1.0000								
CC	.6040	.6408	1.0000							
DD	.6295	.6820	.5973	1.0000						
EE	.6177	.6820	.6256	.6719	1.0000					

```
            CORRELATION MATRIX

               AA        BB        CC        DD        EE        FF        GG        HH        II        JJ

FF           .5840     .6034     .5903     .6012     .7021    1.0000

GG           .5812     .6374     .5996     .6254     .6891     .7910    1.0000
HH           .5948     .7394     .5658     .6368     .7440     .6556     .7204    1.0000
II           .3501     .3520     .2591     .3665     .4118     .4841     .4775     .4225    1.0000
JJ           .3332     .3202     .2679     .3384     .4432     .3668     .4156     .4126     .5089    1.0000
KK           .4009     .4155     .3255     .5251     .3975     .3505     .3904     .3944     .3959     .4354
LL           .4850     .5074     .3981     .5007     .4873     .4057     .3913     .4455     .3874     .4154
MM           .4540     .4964     .3694     .4612     .5307     .4592     .4536     .4595     .5484     .5351
NN           .4735     .5226     .3853     .4972     .4779     .4748     .4876     .4562     .5298     .4818
OO           .3787     .4376     .3265     .4411     .5296     .5216     .4747     .4787     .5412     .4944

               KK        LL        MM        NN        OO

KK          1.0000
LL           .5151    1.0000
MM           .5277     .6012    1.0000
NN           .4760     .5584     .6156    1.0000
OO           .4352     .4952     .6899     .5501    1.0000

       # OF CASES =          1070.0


ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

             SCALE      SCALE     CORRECTED
             MEAN      VARIANCE     ITEM-       SQUARED      ALPHA
            IF ITEM    IF ITEM      TOTAL       MULTIPLE     IF ITEM
            DELETED    DELETED   CORRELATION  CORRELATION    DELETED

Q           59.2636    505.5488     .6427        .5469        .9632
R           60.4869    485.4867     .7505        .6784        .9622
S           59.4804    492.2162     .7986        .7223        .9618
T           60.2673    485.6104     .7707        .7064        .9620
U           59.8907    490.8458     .6945        .5708        .9627
V           59.6841    491.1929     .7687        .6760        .9620
W           59.9664    484.9848     .8286        .7414        .9614
X           59.5383    493.7455     .7560        .6392        .9622
Y           59.2458    496.9227     .7831        .6961        .9621
Z           60.4925    479.8554     .7692        .7613        .9621
AA          60.5093    475.2810     .7724        .7609        .9622
BB          59.7579    483.8413     .8150        .7353        .9616
CC          59.5028    495.7226     .7103        .5607        .9626
DD          59.6121    486.3836     .7669        .6470        .9620
EE          59.5897    488.6295     .8150        .7224        .9616
FF          59.4813    492.9795     .7840        .7496        .9619
GG          59.3131    495.9720     .7804        .7297        .9620
HH          59.5411    489.0250     .7877        .7117        .9618
II          59.3178    518.0074     .5063        .4832        .9642
JJ          59.7542    510.3614     .4943        .4446        .9642
KK          59.7636    503.7504     .4996        .4583        .9645
LL          59.8953    501.6223     .5889        .5337        .9636
MM          59.5692    505.3512     .6278        .6610        .9633
NN          59.7065    504.2075     .6090        .5433        .9634
OO          59.5738    509.8369     .5828        .5865        .9636

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS    25 ITEMS

ALPHA =    .9640          STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9644
```

Table 13

Reliability Analysis: Reasons for School Choice-Construct Subscale

```
  1.      Q            Choice Reasons- Academic/Curriculum
  2.      V            Choice Reasons- Religion/Values
  3.      II           Choice Reasons- Discipline
  4.      R            Choice Reasons- Child's Choice
  5.      U            Choice Reasons- Convenience/Safety
  6.      X            Choice Reasons- Affordable Tuition
  7.      T            Choice Reasons- Athletics


                CORRELATION MATRIX


                 Q          V          II         R          U          X          T

Q             1.0000
V              .7531     1.0000
II             .4004      .4610     1.0000
R              .6062      .6902      .3310     1.0000
U              .6393      .7098      .3681      .6298     1.0000
X              .5428      .6235      .3690      .6522      .5591     1.0000
T              .5765      .6149      .3052      .7124      .5860      .6570     1.0000


         # OF CASES =            1070.0


ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

             SCALE        SCALE      CORRECTED
             MEAN       VARIANCE       ITEM-        SQUARED        ALPHA
            IF ITEM      IF ITEM       TOTAL        MULTIPLE      IF ITEM
            DELETED      DELETED    CORRELATION   CORRELATION     DELETED

Q           15.7907      38.6689       .7430         .6047         .8813
V           15.8925      39.2766       .8263         .7126         .8724
II          16.0907      48.6606       .4441         .2306         .9105
R           16.5103      38.4260       .7767         .6376         .8771
U           16.3028      36.6847       .7398         .5677         .8839
X           16.3112      41.2772       .7158         .5409         .8850
T           17.0402      38.8506       .7345         .5933         .8824


RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS      7 ITEMS

ALPHA =    .9003           STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .8996
```

Table 14

Reliability Analysis: School Problems-Original Items

1.	DX	Problem- Student misbehavior
2.	DY	Problem- Poor curriculum
3.	DZ	Problem- Low teachers salaries
4.	EA	Problem- Prejudice/racial conflict
5.	EB	Problem- Poor teachers or teaching
6.	EC	Problem- School too small
7.	ED	Problem- School too large
8.	EF	Problem- Classes overcrowded
9.	EG	Problem- Teachers don't discipline students
10.	EH	Problem- Inadequate resources
11.	EI	Problem- Attitude of those who run school
12.	EJ	Problem- Lack of student interest
13.	EK	Problem- Too many rules & regulations
14.	EL	Problem- Lack of enough money to operate
15.	EM	Problem- Lack of parent interest
16.	EN	Problem- Lack of staff interest in parents/school
17.	EO	Problem- Racial composition of student body
18.	EP	Problem- Gender composition of student body
19.	FS	Problem- Lack of after school activities

CORRELATION MATRIX

	DX	DY	DZ	EA	EB	EC	ED	EF	EG	EH
DX	1.0000									
DY	.7625	1.0000								
DZ	.5514	.6212	1.0000							
EA	.7263	.7955	.6449	1.0000						
EB	.7411	.8100	.6062	.8276	1.0000					
EC	.6862	.7346	.6194	.7303	.7805	1.0000				
ED	.6761	.7385	.6416	.7666	.7702	.8291	1.0000			
EF	.7294	.7692	.6614	.8067	.8118	.7920	.8034	1.0000		
EG	.7510	.7953	.6009	.789[illegible]	.8313	.7309	.7447	.8410	1.0000	
EH	.6476	.6822	.6071	.7260	.7344	.6765	.7075	.7429	.7549	1.0000
EI	.7137	.7424	.5914	.7655	.7934	.7131	.7476	.7832	.8123	.7713
EJ	.7593	.7827	.5835	.7505	.7981	.7006	.6951	.7700	.8151	.7459
EK	.7030	.7241	.5743	.7604	.7526	.7221	.7794	.7536	.7455	.7375
EL	.7014	.7178	.6066	.7087	.7832	.6941	.6874	.7609	.7753	.7453
EM	.6993	.8024	.6148	.7558	.7908	.7023	.7271	.7635	.8083	.7041
EN	.7054	.7767	.5866	.7838	.8009	.7000	.7497	.7493	.7962	.7270
EO	.6869	.7477	.6320	.8011	.7834	.6912	.7550	.7802	.7248	.7238
EP	.6116	.6616	.6074	.7455	.7101	.6616	.7424	.7084	.6856	.6793
FS	.6700	.7251	.6179	.7627	.7584	.7188	.8001	.7501	.7392	.7572

	EI	EJ	EK	EL	EM	EN	EO	EP	FS
EI	1.0000								
EJ	.8014	1.0000							
EK	.8511	.7474	1.0000						
EL	.7451	.7725	.7172	1.0000					
EM	.7605	.8022	.7345	.7736	1.0000				
EN	.8178	.7992	.7972	.7405	.8387	1.0000			
EO	.7815	.7779	.7636	.7222	.7573	.8016	1.0000		
EP	.7430	.6788	.7442	.6564	.7048	.7503	.7978	1.0000	
FS	.7930	.7502	.8016	.7303	.7771	.7986	.8031	.7898	1.0000

OF CASES = 1070.0

```
ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

                 SCALE          SCALE       CORRECTED
                 MEAN         VARIANCE        ITEM-         SQUARED         ALPHA
                IF ITEM        IF ITEM        TOTAL         MULTIPLE        IF ITEM
                DELETED        DELETED     CORRELATION    CORRELATION      DELETED

DX              50.3710       478.2037        .8006          .6856           .9800

DY              49.9280       476.4354        .8595          .7824           .9794

DZ              50.1383       473.1614        .6964          .5284           .9816

EA              49.9888       475.5228        .8760          .7977           .9792

EB              49.9888       473.6220        .8922          .8260           .9791

EC              49.8916       480.1005        .8239          .7602           .9797

ED              49.6897       483.3143        .8558          .8083           .9795

EF              49.8626       475.2318        .8854          .8233           .9792

EG              49.9084       473.9654        .8832          .8353           .9792

EH              50.0467       476.1587        .8242          .7106           .9797

EI              49.9019       476.1316        .8808          .8264           .9792

EJ              50.1028       471.0727        .8689          .7984           .9793

EK              49.9056       479.9770        .8584          .7979           .9795

EL              50.2234       471.0249        .8363          .7361           .9797

EM              50.2720       472.0560        .8681          .8045           .9793

EN              49.9252       475.1637        .8805          .8196           .9792

EO              49.8869       476.5213        .8681          .8038           .9793

EP              49.8056       479.7377        .8097          .7286           .9799

FS              49.9570       479.2984        .8682          .8001           .9794

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     19 ITEMS

ALPHA =    .9806           STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9815
```

Table 15

Reliability Analysis: School Problems-Construct Subscale

```
  1.     DY          School Problems- Curriculum/Teachers
  2.     EA          School Problems- Finances
  3.     EO          School Problems- Student Body Composition
  4.     DX          School Problems- Moral/Ethical Behavior
  5.     EC          School Problems- School Conditions
  6.     EK          School Problems- School Policy
  7.     EJ          School Problems- Poor Attitude/Lack of Interest


                 CORRELATION MATRIX


               DY          EA          EO          DX          EC          EK          EJ


DY           1.0000
EA            .8077      1.0000
EO            .7115       .6999      1.0000
DX            .7896       .9555       .6854      1.0000
EC            .8225       .7771       .7507       .7651      1.0000
EK            .7591       .7401       .7984       .7293       .7742      1.0000
EJ            .8333       .7832       .7523       .7665       .7801 .     .8069      1.0000


       # OF CASES =              1070.0


ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

               SCALE        SCALE     CORRECTED
               MEAN       VARIANCE      ITEM-        SQUARED        ALPHA
              IF ITEM      IF ITEM      TOTAL        MULTIPLE       IF ITEM
              DELETED      DELETED   CORRELATION   CORRELATION     DELETED

DY            18.1393      54.3913      .8754         .7922          .9519
EA            18.1804      52.9020      .8880         .9224          .9510
EO            18.1402      55.5407      .8024         .6938          .9577
DX            18.2037      52.7891      .8718         .9147          .9525
EC            18.0430      55.4668      .8628         .7581          .9531
EK            18.1879      56.9123      .8491         .7556          .9545
EJ            18.1430      54.0852      .8734         .7835          .9521


RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     7 ITEMS

ALPHA =    .9597          STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9603
```

Table 16
Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Characteristics-Original Items

```
  1.     AH          In curriculum- Liberal political beliefs
  2.     AI          In curriculum- Conservative political beliefs
  3.     AJ          In curriculum- Modern attitudes toward women
  4.     AK          In curriculum- Traditional attitudes toward women
  5.     AL          In curriculum- Sex education
  6.     AM          In curriculum- Homework
  7.     AN          In curriculum- Discipline
  8.     AO          In curriculum- Minority representation
  9.     AP          In curriculum- Religion
 10.     AQ          In curriculum- Teachers ask students to talk about personal feelings
 11.     AR          In curriculum- Vatican II ideas
 12.     AS          In curriculum- Theory of evolution
 13.     AT          In curriculum- Helping the poor
 14.     AU          In curriculum- Social justice issues

              CORRELATION MATRIX
           AH          AI          AJ          AK          AL          AM          AN          AO          AP          AQ
AH       1.0000
AI        .8757      1.0000
AJ        .7261       .7502      1.0000
AK        .7239       .7484       .7914      1.0000
AL        .7254       .7371       .7278       .7454      1.0000
AM        .7182       .7244       .6889       .7169       .7649      1.0000
AN        .7110       .7309       .6957       .7128       .7513       .8696      1.0000
AO        .7203       .7505       .7052       .7197       .7304       .7511       .7338      1.0000
AP        .7518       .7791       .7467       .7432       .7943       .8787       .8443       .7824      1.0000
AQ        .7040       .7283       .7160       .6968       .7074       .7350       .7325       .7406       .7860      1.0000
AR        .7708       .7835       .7105       .7139       .7320       .7280       .7254       .7639       .7855       .7766
AS        .7340       .7718       .6956       .7005       .7303       .7167       .7304       .7429       .7542       .7301
AT        .7168       .7389       .7021       .6995       .7440       .7770       .7447       .7393       .8453       .7352
AU        .7479       .7610       .7087       .6941       .7397       .7270       .7119       .7572       .7978       .7573

           AR          AS          AT          AU
AR       1.0000
AS        .8274      1.0000                             # OF CASES =  1070.0
 AT        .7582       .7402      1.0000
AU        .7851       .7745       .8159      1.0000

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS
           SCALE       SCALE      CORRECTED
           MEAN       VARIANCE      ITEM-        SQUARED        ALPHA
          IF ITEM      IF ITEM      TOTAL        MULTIPLE      IF ITEM
          DELETED      DELETED   CORRELATION   CORRELATION     DELETED
AH        34.5514     358.5507      .8483         .7975         .9730
AI        34.6234     355.0096      .8723         .8257         .9725
AJ        34.0449     357.6556      .8226         .7169         .9735
AK        34.2308     358.4228      .8261         .7221         .9734
AL        33.7935     362.5270      .8445         .7241         .9730
AM        33.4486     374.1522      .8560         .8364         .9733
AN        33.4346     371.2525      .8468         .8001         .9732
AO        34.0458     359.1850      .8461         .7207         .9730
AP        33.4561     369.9882      .9036         .8701         .9725
AQ        34.0318     362.4031      .8374         .7171         .9731
AR        34.6364     355.7283      .8696         .7897         .9726
AS        34.4439     355.7401      .8491         .7576         .9730
AT        33.6626     367.1218      .8553         .7778         .9729
AU        34.0523     360.1787      .8600         .7732         .9727

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     14 ITEMS
ALPHA =    .9749          STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9764
```

Table 17

Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Characteristics-Construct Subscale

```
  1.    AH          In Curriculum- Liberal/Modern Beliefs about Women
  2.    AI          In Curriculum- Conservative/Traditional Beliefs about Women
  3.    AL          In Curriculum- Sex Education
  4.    AM          In Curriculum- Homework
  5.    AN          In Curriculum- Discipline
  6.    AO          In Curriculum- Ethnic Curriculum
  7.    AP          In Curriculum- Religion
  8.    AQ          In Curriculum- Students Express Personal Feelings
  9.    AR          In Curriculum- Vatican II Ideas
 10.    AS          In Curriculum- Theory of Evolution
 11.    AT          In Curriculum- Helping the Poor
 12.    AU          In Curriculum- Social Justice Issues

                 CORRELATION MATRIX

               AH        AI        AL        AM        AN        AO        AP        AQ        AR        AS

AH          1.0000
AI           .8180    1.0000
AL           .7467     .7664    1.0000
AM           .7091     .7334     .7649    1.0000
AN           .7167     .7494     .7513     .8696    1.0000
AO           .7275     .7567     .7304     .7511     .7338    1.0000
AP           .7695     .7660     .7943     .8787     .8443     .7824    1.0000
AQ           .7290     .7170     .7074     .7350     .7325     .7406     .7860    1.0000
AR           .7507     .7530     .7320     .7280     .7254     .7639     .7855     .7766    1.0000
AS           .7335     .7569     .7303     .7167     .7304     .7429     .7542     .7301     .8274    1.0000
AT           .7244     .7260     .7440     .7770     .7447     .7393     .8453     .7352     .7582     .7402
AU           .7446     .7363     .7397     .7270     .7119     .7572     .7978     .7573     .7851     .7745

               AT        AU

AT          1.0000
AU           .8159    1.0000

       # OF CASES =              1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

             SCALE         SCALE     CORRECTED
              MEAN       VARIANCE      ITEM-          SQUARED         ALPHA
            IF ITEM       IF ITEM      TOTAL         MULTIPLE        IF ITEM
            DELETED       DELETED   CORRELATION     CORRELATION      DELETED

AH          29.8673      251.1928       .8428           .7437          .9699
AI          29.9617      250.0874       .8547           .7648          .9696
AL          29.4729      255.4843       .8436           .7215          .9697
AM          29.1280      265.1258       .8594           .8347          .9699
AN          29.1140      262.6287       .8510           .8021          .9698
AO          29.7252      252.5793       .8470           .7212          .9697
AP          29.1355      261.6346       .9070           .8694          .9688
AQ          29.7112      255.3057       .8379           .7139          .9699
AR          30.3159      249.8477       .8674           .7823          .9692
AS          30.1234      249.6405       .8507           .7562          .9697
AT          29.3421      259.1813       .8584           .7775          .9695
AU          29.7318      253.4051       .8614           .7705          .9693

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     12 ITEMS
ALPHA =    .9720             STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9739
```

Table 18

Reliability Analysis: Participation-Original Items

1.	DE	Have you- Acting as a teacher or substitute teacher
2.	DF	Have you- Acting as a classroom aide or teachers aide
3.	DG	Have you- Serving on school board, advisory, or parent board member
4.	DH	Have you- Attending parent meetings
5.	DI	Have you- Acting as guest speaker
6.	DJ	Have you- Attending meetings on local, social, and political issues
7.	DK	Have you- Attending meetings to discuss community problems
8.	DL	Have you- Attending meetings to discuss school problems
9.	DM	Have you- Helping with class trips
10.	DN	Have you- Helping with extra-curricular activities
11.	DO	Have you- Making sure homework is done

CORRELATION MATRIX

	DE	DF	DG	DH	DI	DJ	DK	DL	DM	DN	DO
DE	1.0000										
DF	.9284	1.0000									
DG	.9124	.9574	1.0000								
DH	.8353	.8655	.8678	1.0000							
DI	.9149	.9334	.9216	.8698	1.0000						
DJ	.9000	.9314	.9302	.8840	.9445	1.0000					
DK	.8817	.9131	.9222	.8779	.9274	.9580	1.0000				
DL	.8859	.9057	.9054	.8760	.9294	.9489	.9316	1.0000			
DM	.8762	.9085	.9138	.8587	.9048	.9262	.9210	.9041	1.0000		
DN	.8901	.9209	.9307	.8838	.9224	.9470	.9484	.9235	.9423	1.0000	
DO	.8461	.8759	.8743	.8780	.8779	.9044	.8987	.8876	.8796	.9194	1.00

# OF CASES = 1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

	SCALE MEAN IF ITEM DELETED	SCALE VARIANCE IF ITEM DELETED	CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATION	ALPHA IF ITEM DELETED
DE	25.2794	475.0996	.9117	.8836	.9586
DF	25.2654	471.8958	.9436	.9426	.9577
DG	25.2131	471.3802	.9410	.9363	.9577
DH	24.7019	483.9269	.8913	.8300	.9595
DI	25.2645	470.7803	.9451	.9261	.9576
DJ	25.1505	470.7341	.9585	.9544	.9573
DK	25.1103	471.3386	.9489	.9383	.9576
DL	24.9654	474.6433	.9369	.9177	.9580
DM	25.1402	471.7165	.9309	.9050	.9580
DN	25.1252	470.7832	.9484	.9468	.9575
DO	24.6308	482.6971	.9081	.8706	.9591

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS 11 ITEMS

ALPHA = .9641 STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA = .9785

Table 19

Reliability Analysis: Participation-Construct Subscale

```
1.     DM          Participators- Helpers

2.     DO          Participators- Homework Monitors

3.     DH          Participators- Attenders

4.     DG          Participators- Board Members

5.     DE          Participators- Teachers and Aides


                CORRELATION MATRIX


              DM          DO          DH          DG          DE


DM          1.0000

DO           .9062      1.0000

DH           .9065       .8903      1.0000

DG           .9040       .8847       .8966      1.0000

DE           .8879       .8550       .8882       .9325      1.0000


        # OF CASES =            1070.0


ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

              SCALE        SCALE      CORRECTED
              MEAN       VARIANCE       ITEM-        SQUARED        ALPHA
             IF ITEM      IF ITEM       TOTAL        MULTIPLE      IF ITEM
             DELETED      DELETED    CORRELATION   CORRELATION     DELETED

DM            8.3897      67.1230       .9397         .8875         .9697

DO            8.0037      71.4686       .9179         .8565         .9735

DH            7.9430      69.0248       .9327         .8716         .9708

DG            8.5860      67.3672       .9455         .9060         .9688

DE            8.5168      66.5549       .9279         .8863         .9718


RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     5 ITEMS

ALPHA =    .9766          STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9771
```

Table 20

Reliability Analysis: Decision Makers-Original Items

1.	BK	Advise- Hiring & firing teachers
2.	BL	Advise- Standards for student behavior
3.	BM	Advise- Ways students are graded
4.	BN	Advise- School budget
5.	BO	Advise- Textbooks & other materials used
6.	BP	Advise- What subjects are taught
7.	BQ	Advise- How subjects are taught
8.	BR	Advise- Hiring & firing of administrators
9.	BS	Advise- Ways school & parents work together
10.	BT	Advise- School's daily schedule
11.	BU	Advise- Way religion is taught
12.	BV	Advise- Setting school goals
13.	BW	Advise- Setting admission policy
14.	BX	Advise- How money is raised
15.	FR	Advise- Setting teachers salaries

CORRELATION MATRIX

	BK	BL	BM	BN	BO	BP	BQ	BR	BS	BT
BK	1.0000									
BL	.7730	1.0000								
BM	.7725	.8144	1.0000							
BN	.7292	.7836	.7724	1.0000						
BO	.8002	.8129	.8765	.7868	1.0000					
BP	.7836	.7993	.8251	.8039	.9213	1.0000				
BQ	.7707	.7431	.8231	.7151	.8777	.8317	1.0000			
BR	.6560	.6721	.7052	.6218	.7652	.7426	.6811	1.0000		
BS	.6626	.6896	.7101	.6393	.7845	.7404	.7151	.8776	1.0000	
BT	.6895	.7028	.7402	.6551	.8242	.7685	.7400	.9257	.9378	1.0000
BU	.6903	.7055	.7434	.6517	.8220	.7681	.7424	.9212	.9400	.9826
BV	.6934	.7141	.7081	.6593	.7914	.7704	.7083	.8888	.9143	.9342
BW	.6742	.7133	.7465	.6580	.8019	.7493	.7280	.9199	.9146	.9524
BX	.6486	.7063	.7221	.6523	.7838	.7322	.7099	.8964	.9163	.9262
FR	.6579	.6904	.7186	.6367	.7706	.7214	.7083	.8937	.8824	.9279

	BU	BV	BW	BX	FR
BU	1.0000				
BV	.9365	1.0000			
BW	.9517	.9118	1.0000		
BX	.9279	.9040	.9290	1.0000	
FR	.9284	.8830	.9303	.8976	1.0000

OF CASES = 1070.0

```
ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

               SCALE        SCALE      CORRECTED
               MEAN        VARIANCE      ITEM-        SQUARED        ALPHA
              IF ITEM      IF ITEM       TOTAL        MULTIPLE      IF ITEM
              DELETED      DELETED    CORRELATION   CORRELATION     DELETED

BK            25.2449     332.8268       .7731         .7197         .9383

BL            25.0439     328.5004       .7994         .7673         .9374

BM            25.1355     326.6018       .8328         .8206         .9368

BN            25.0850     326.1845       .7461         .7198         .9380

BO            25.1477     325.0708       .8974         .9219         .9358

BP            25.1131     326.0761       .8569         .8808         .9364

BQ            25.1626     325.6031       .8058         .7991         .9370

BR            25.0879     323.0437       .8947         .8925         .9355

BS            24.9963     322.9672       .8671         .9125         .9359

BT            25.1402     321.1309       .9262         .9727         .9348

BU            25.1523     321.2387       .9248         .9724         .9349

BV            25.0411     321.1938       .8927         .9044         .9353

BW            25.1486     320.6149       .9106         .9375         .9350

BX            24.9794     321.8780       .8776         .9054         .9356

FR            25.1654     320.9034       .8804         .8918         .9354

BZ            20.7159     333.0979       .1417         .2099         .9821


RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS    15 ITEMS

ALPHA =    .9821           STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9744
```

Table 21

Reliability Analysis: Decision Makers-Construct Subscale

```
1.     BM          Decision Makers- Curriculum

2.     BN          Decision Makers- Finances

3.     BK          Decision Makers- Personnel

4.     BL          Decision Makers- School Policy

5.     BV          Decision Makers- School Goals

6.     BS          Decision Makers- Home/School Relations


                 CORRELATION MATRIX


               BM         BN         BK         BL         BV         BS


BM           1.0000

BN            .7688     1.0000

BK            .8641      .7956     1.0000

BL            .8335      .8076      .8867     1.0000

BV            .8215      .7863      .8867      .8617     1.0000

BS            .8065      .7746      .8467      .8442      .9143     1.0000


      # OF CASES =           1070.0


ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

               SCALE       SCALE     CORRECTED
               MEAN      VARIANCE      ITEM-        SQUARED       ALPHA
              IF ITEM     IF ITEM      TOTAL        MULTIPLE     IF ITEM
              DELETED     DELETED   CORRELATION   CORRELATION    DELETED

BM            13.3766     69.2752      .7855         .7818        .7483

BN            13.2860     70.0977      .7085         .7096        .7577

BK            13.4916     69.5654      .8749         .8767        .7421

BL            13.4075     69.6243      .8229         .8379        .7461

BV            13.5000     71.1370      .8261         .8845        .7504

BS            13.4551     72.6093      .7681         .8583        .7587

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     6 ITEMS

ALPHA =    .9660         STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9519
```

Table 22

Reliability Analysis: Communication-Original Items

```
  1.     J          Communication- Talks with Teacher
  2.     K          Communication- Telephone
  3.     L          Communication- Parent Meetings
  4.     M          Communication- Parent/Teacher Conferences
  5.     N          Communication- At Home
  6.     O          Communication- Parent Usually Initiates Talks
  7.     P          Communication- School Responsive to Parents Request for Meetings

                 CORRELATION MATRIX

               J         K         L         M         N         O         P

  J          1.0000

  K          -.0890    1.0000

  L          -.0957     .9044    1.0000

  M          -.0791     .9016     .8943    1.0000

  N           .4887     .2239     .2171     .2105    1.0000

  O           .0270     .2000     .2305     .2083     .1366    1.0000

  P           .0522     .2005     .2284     .2301     .2660     .2462    1.0000

        # OF CASES =           1070.0

  ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

               SCALE        SCALE      CORRECTED
               MEAN       VARIANCE       ITEM-        SQUARED        ALPHA
               IF ITEM     IF ITEM       TOTAL        MULTIPLE       IF ITEM
               DELETED     DELETED    CORRELATION   CORRELATION     DELETED

  J            12.4093    117.2691      -.0218          .2858          .7953

  K            12.8112     65.7978       .8094          .8624          .6405

  L            12.6131     66.5012       .8257          .8537          .6361

  M            12.6093     66.6555       .8180          .8480          .6385

  N            13.5813    111.1884       .3249          .3489          .7668

  O            11.7860     99.4144       .2601          .0952          .7782

  P            12.3729    104.6120       .2906          .1417          .7657

  RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS      7 ITEMS

  ALPHA =    .7623          STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .7181
```

Table 23

Reliability Analysis: Reasons for Non-Participation-Original Items

1.	DQ	Not involved- Baby sitting/child care
2.	DR	Not involved- Lack of transportation
3.	DS	Not involved- Principal's & teachers' attitudes
4.	DT	Not involved- Conflict with working hours
5.	DU	Not involved- Belief that principal & teachers job is to run the school
6.	DV	Not involved- Different language spoken by school people

CORRELATION MATRIX

	DQ	DR	DS	DT	DU	DV
DQ	1.0000					
DR	.8684	1.0000				
DS	.9259	.9050	1.0000			
DT	.7454	.7865	.7839	1.0000		
DU	.8491	.8436	.8898	.7238	1.0000	
DV	.8428	.8572	.8758	.7167	.8492	1.0000

# OF CASES = 1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

	SCALE MEAN IF ITEM DELETED	SCALE VARIANCE IF ITEM DELETED	CORRECTED ITEM- TOTAL CORRELATION	SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATION	ALPHA IF ITEM DELETED
DQ	8.1299	60.2497	.9144	.8655	.9588
DR	8.1617	61.2414	.9211	.8530	.9583
DS	8.2458	58.9246	.9528	.9191	.9546
DT	7.7850	65.3139	.7930	.6480	.9709
DU	8.1112	61.1410	.8952	.8164	.9608
DV	8.1645	59.6605	.8912	.8076	.9615

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS 6 ITEMS

ALPHA = .9673 STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA = .9672

Table 24

Reliability Analysis: Reasons for Non-Participation-Construct Subscale

1.	DQ	Not involved- Child Care
2.	DR	Not involved- Lack of Transportation
3.	DT	Not involved- Working Hours
4.	DS	Not involved- Principal & Teacher Attitudes
5.	DU	Not involved- Delegation of Responsibility

CORRELATION MATRIX

	DQ	DR	DT	DS	DU
DQ	1.0000				
DR	.8684	1.0000			
DT	.7518	.7932	1.0000		
DS	.8609	.8443	.7298	1.0000	
DU	.8491	.8436	.7301	.8519	1.0000

OF CASES = 1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

	SCALE MEAN IF ITEM DELETED	SCALE VARIANCE IF ITEM DELETED	CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATION	ALPHA IF ITEM DELETED
DQ	6.7308	37.8115	.9049	.8266	.9399
DR	6.7626	38.6321	.9098	.8298	.9394
DT	6.3916	41.7427	.7955	.6509	.9580
DS	6.6850	36.5639	.8904	.8069	.9433
DU	6.7121	38.4877	.8868	.7965	.9430

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS 5 ITEMS

ALPHA = .9555 STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA = .9558

Table 25

Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Knowledge & General Characteristics-Construct Subscale

1.	AH	Curriculum Knowledge- Liberal/Modern Beliefs
2.	AI	Curriculum Knowledge- Conservative/Traditional Beliefs
3.	AL	Curriculum Knowledge- Sex Education
4.	AM	Curriculum Knowledge- Homework
5.	AN	Curriculum Knowledge- Discipline
6.	AO	Curriculum Knowledge- Ethnic Curriculum
7.	AP	Curriculum Knowledge- Religion
8.	AQ	Curriculum Knowledge- Students Express Personal Feelings
9.	AR	Curriculum Knowledge- Vatican II Ideas
10.	AS	Curriculum Knowledge- Theory of Evolution
11.	AT	Curriculum Knowledge- Helping the Poor
12.	AU	Curriculum Knowledge- Social Justice Issues
13.	I	General School Knowledge

CORRELATION MATRIX

	AH	AI	AL	AM	AN	AO	AP	AQ	AR	AS
AH	1.0000									
AI	.8308	1.0000								
AL	.8385	.8585	1.0000							
AM	.7733	.7945	.8408	1.0000						
AN	.7738	.8066	.8346	.8859	1.0000					
AO	.8296	.8525	.8733	.8488	.8282	1.0000				
AP	.8400	.8367	.8731	.9001	.8737	.8947	1.0000			
AQ	.8226	.8023	.8278	.8430	.8403	.8744	.9008	1.0000		
AR	.8238	.8218	.8625	.8250	.8100	.8813	.8820	.8893	1.0000	
AS	.7989	.8287	.8572	.8090	.8113	.8738	.8557	.8439	.9094	1.0000
AT	.8151	.8142	.8463	.8481	.8235	.8715	.9218	.8558	.8788	.8541
AU	.8385	.8369	.8671	.8411	.8223	.8958	.9188	.8835	.9065	.8824
I	.0758	.0410	.0435	.0621	.0519	.0572	.0550	.0833	.0646	.0513

	AT	AU	I
AT	1.0000		
AU	.9375	1.0000	
I	.0572	.0683	1.0000

# OF CASES = 1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

	SCALE MEAN IF ITEM DELETED	SCALE VARIANCE IF ITEM DELETED	CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATION	ALPHA IF ITEM DELETED
AH	15.1178	368.1264	.8762	.7886	.9745
AI	15.1570	367.0548	.8847	.8100	.9743
AL	15.0710	369.6095	.9159	.8550	.9736
AM	15.0075	379.2198	.8970	.8581	.9741
AN	14.9626	375.8733	.8859	.8354	.9742
AO	15.2355	367.6975	.9316	.8751	.9732
AP	14.9925	374.1852	.9485	.9255	.9731
AQ	15.2318	371.8995	.9175	.8683	.9736
AR	15.5364	367.2367	.9288	.8959	.9733
AS	15.3981	366.3802	.9105	.8645	.9737
AT	15.0944	373.9714	.9247	.9045	.9735
AU	15.2738	369.7350	.9433	.9234	.9730
I	13.9813	436.6526	.0637	.0148	.9851

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS 13 ITEMS

ALPHA = .9766 STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA = .9722

Table 26
Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Emphasis-Original Items

```
  1.        AV              Emphasis- Liberal political beliefs
  2.        AW              Emphasis- Conservative political beliefs
  3.        AX              Emphasis- Modern attitudes toward women
  4.        AY              Emphasis- Traditional attitudes toward women
  5.        AZ              Emphasis- Sex education
  6.        BA              Emphasis- Homework
  7.        BC              Emphasis- Discipline
  8.        BD              Emphasis- Minority representation
  9.        BE              Emphasis- Religion
 10.        BF              Emphasis- Teachers ask students to talk about personal feelings
 11.        BG              Emphasis- Vatican II ideas
 12.        BH              Emphasis- Theory of evolution
 13.        BI              Emphasis- Helping the poor
 14.        BJ              Emphasis- Social justice issues


              CORRELATION MATRIX
           AV         AW         AX         AY         AZ         BA         BC         BD         BE         BF
AV       1.0000
AW        .9035     1.0000
AX        .7650      .7868     1.0000
AY        .7025      .7329      .8121     1.0000
AZ        .6719      .7035      .7225      .6868     1.0000
BA        .6489      .6732      .6711      .6322      .7035     1.0000
BC        .6731      .6903      .6631      .6532      .6717      .8022     1.0000
BD        .6896      .7173      .6973      .6543      .7136      .7198      .7134     1.0000
BE        .6738      .6909      .6879      .6321      .6972      .7720      .7677      .7025     1.0000
BF        .7210      .7511      .7253      .6912      .7079      .7233      .7394      .7379      .7496     1.0000
BG        .7498      .7901      .7202      .6927      .7117      .6717      .6875      .7413      .7015      .7937
BH        .7169      .7622      .6757      .6714      .6932      .6506      .6832      .6913      .6566      .7439
BI        .7050      .7293      .7249      .6669      .7144      .7855      .7680      .7490      .7760      .7580
BJ        .7426      .7364      .7154      .6719      .7098      .7144      .7261      .7299      .7385      .7859

           BG         BH         BI         BJ
BG       1.0000
BH        .8110     1.0000                           # OF CASES = 1070.0
 BI        .7304      .7104     1.0000
BJ        .7667      .7247      .8114     1.0000

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS
          SCALE       SCALE      CORRECTED
          MEAN       VARIANCE      ITEM-       SQUARED       ALPHA
         IF ITEM     IF ITEM       TOTAL       MULTIPLE     IF ITEM
         DELETED     DELETED    CORRELATION   CORRELATION   DELETED
AV       35.9505    417.8844       .8413        .8330        .9695
AW       36.0009    414.6015       .8711        .8622        .9689
AX       35.5598    419.5320       .8399        .7706        .9695
AY       35.5374    420.0019       .7952        .7049        .9705
AZ       35.3262    426.3734       .8119        .6729        .9701
BA       34.9542    437.2000       .8123        .7456        .9703
BC       35.0318    433.6416       .8198        .7392        .9701
BD       35.4224    425.1703       .8250        .6934        .9698
BE       35.0150    431.6705       .8204        .7249        .9700
BF       35.6112    420.1088       .8621        .7587        .9691
BG       36.0234    412.7394       .8601        .7807        .9692
BH       35.8439    413.7857       .8231        .7242        .9701
BI       35.2252    430.2401       .8584        .7814        .9694
BJ       35.5720    422.3779       .8559        .7640        .9692

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     14 ITEMS
ALPHA =   .9718          STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =   .9729
```

Table 27

Reliability Analysis: Curriculum Emphasis-Construct Subscale

1.	AV	Emphasis- Liberal/Modern Beliefs
2.	AW	Emphasis- Conservative/Traditional Belief
3.	AZ	Emphasis- Sex Education
4.	BA	Emphasis- Homework
5.	BC	Emphasis- Discipline
6.	BD	Emphasis- Ethnic Curriculum
7.	BE	Emphasis- Religion is Taught
8.	BF	Emphasis- Students Express Personal Feelings
9.	BG	Emphasis- Vatican II Ideas
10.	BH	Emphasis- Theory of Evolution
11.	BI	Emphasis- Helping the Poor
12.	BJ	Emphasis- Social Justice Issues

CORRELATION MATRIX

	AV	AW	AZ	BA	BC	BD	BE	BF	BG	BH
AV	1.0000									
AW	.8601	1.0000								
AZ	.7079	.6942	1.0000							
BA	.6636	.6413	.7035	1.0000						
BC	.6621	.6523	.6717	.8022	1.0000					
BD	.7028	.6773	.7136	.7198	.7134	1.0000				
BE	.6979	.6502	.6972	.7720	.7677	.7025	1.0000			
BF	.7256	.7018	.7079	.7233	.7394	.7379	.7496	1.0000		
BG	.7504	.7359	.7117	.6717	.6875	.7413	.7015	.7937	1.0000	
BH	.7032	.7147	.6932	.6506	.6832	.6913	.6566	.7439	.8110	1.0000
BI	.7272	.6848	.7144	.7855	.7680	.7490	.7760	.7580	.7304	.7104
BJ	.7418	.6874	.7098	.7144	.7261	.7299	.7385	.7859	.7667	.7247

	BI	BJ
BI	1.0000	
BJ	.8114	1.0000

# OF CASES = 1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

	SCALE MEAN IF ITEM DELETED	SCALE VARIANCE IF ITEM DELETED	CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATION	ALPHA IF ITEM DELETED
AV	30.9533	293.7602	.8398	.7974	.9643
AW	30.9421	292.8685	.8124	.7725	.9652
AZ	30.6458	300.2215	.8107	.6636	.9650
BA	30.2738	308.9942	.8184	.7455	.9652
BC	30.3514	306.1776	.8221	.7366	.9649
BD	30.7421	299.0391	.8269	.6923	.9646
BE	30.3346	304.3145	.8264	.7263	.9647
BF	30.9308	294.9643	.8614	.7554	.9636
BG	31.3430	288.8355	.8583	.7765	.9639
BH	31.1636	289.6973	.8209	.7184	.9651
BI	30.5449	303.2304	.8628	.7796	.9639
BJ	30.8916	296.7703	.8569	.7599	.9638

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS 12 ITEMS

ALPHA = .9674 STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA = .9689

Table 28

Reliability Analysis: Importance of Participation-Original Items

1.	CR	How impt- Acting as a teacher or substitute teacher
2.	CS	How impt- Acting as a classroom aide or teachers aide
3.	CT	How impt- Serving on school board, advisory, or parent board member
4.	CU	How impt- Attending parent meetings
5.	CV	How impt- Acting as guest speaker
6.	CW	How impt- Attending meetings on local, social, and political issues
7.	CX	How impt- Attending meetings to discuss community problems
8.	CY	How impt- Attending meetings to discuss school problems
9.	CZ	How impt- Helping with class trips
10.	DA	How impt- Helping with extra-curricular activities
11.	DB	How impt- Making sure homework is done

CORRELATION MATRIX

	CR	CS	CT	CU	CV	CW	CX	CY	CZ	DA	DB
CR	1.0000										
CS	.8696	1.0000									
CT	.7866	.8699	1.0000								
CU	.7351	.7938	.8094	1.0000							
CV	.8164	.8510	.8382	.7693	1.0000						
CW	.7636	.8142	.8462	.7895	.8271	1.0000					
CX	.7686	.8243	.8612	.7896	.8284	.8822	1.0000				
CY	.7674	.8282	.8821	.8581	.8121	.8585	.8686	1.0000			
CZ	.7498	.8096	.8200	.7839	.8013	.7969	.7947	.8313	1.0000		
DA	.7965	.8419	.8556	.8185	.8283	.8295	.8300	.8675	.8638	1.0000	
DB	.7292	.7914	.8036	.8257	.7767	.7885	.7928	.8534	.7802	.8150	1.000

OF CASES = 1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

	SCALE MEAN IF ITEM DELETED	SCALE VARIANCE IF ITEM DELETED	CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATION	ALPHA IF ITEM DELETED
CR	32.3178	188.6080	.8258	.7830	.9146
CS	32.1561	188.5790	.8843	.8631	.9129
CT	31.8822	190.4295	.8300	.8606	.9136
CU	31.4421	195.6426	.8451	.7850	.9161
CV	32.3121	187.5433	.8703	.8112	.9130
CW	32.0850	188.9460	.8810	.8333	.9131
CX	31.9458	189.6827	.8837	.8448	.9133
CY	31.5308	193.6132	.8960	.8806	.9144
CZ	31.9804	191.4486	.8395	.7911	.9149
DA	31.9486	190.9712	.8695	.8527	.9140
DB	31.3813	198.4008	.8485	.7804	.9171

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS 12 ITEMS

ALPHA = .9261 STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA = .9656

Table 29

Reliability Analysis: Importance of Participation-Construct Subscale

1.	CZ	Importance of Participation- Helpers
2.	DB	Importance of Participation- Homework Monitors
3.	CU	Importance of Participation- Attenders
4.	CT	Importance of Participation- Board Members
5.	CR	Importance of Participation- Teachers & Aides

CORRELATION MATRIX

	CZ	DB	CU	CT	CR
CZ	1.0000				
DB	.1450	1.0000			
CU	.1232	.8083	1.0000		
CT	.0990	.8036	.8386	1.0000	
CR	.1101	.7556	.7978	.8912	1.0000

OF CASES = 1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

	SCALE MEAN IF ITEM DELETED	SCALE VARIANCE IF ITEM DELETED	CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATION	ALPHA IF ITEM DELETED
CZ	11.4140	25.0754	.1267	.0236	.9443
DB	14.6794	29.4042	.7019	.7101	.5940
CU	14.7336	27.8588	.7016	.7606	.5744
CT	15.1804	26.9225	.7083	.8502	.5617
CR	15.1290	26.7111	.6871	.8039	.5638

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS 5 ITEMS

ALPHA = .6917 STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA = .8530

Table 30

Reliability Analysis: Want to Make Decision & Importance of Knowing School-Original Items

1.	CA	Like to- Hiring & firing of teachers
2.	CB	Like to- Standards for student behavior
3.	CD	Like to- Ways students are graded
4.	CE	Like to- School budget
5.	CF	Like to- Textbooks & others materials used
6.	CG	Like to- What subjects are taught
7.	CH	Like to- How subjects are taught
8.	CI	Like to- Hiring & firing of administrators
9.	CJ	Like to- Ways school & parents work together
10.	CK	Like to- Schools daily schedule
11.	CL	Like to- Way religion is taught
12.	CM	Like to- Setting school goals
13.	CN	Like to- Setting admission policy
14.	CO	Like to- How money is raised
15.	CP	Like to- Setting teachers salaries

CORRELATION MATRIX

	CA	CB	CD	CE	CF	CG	CH	CI	CJ	CK
CA	1.0000									
CB	.7681	1.0000								
CD	.7953	.8650	1.0000							
CE	.7700	.8299	.8783	1.0000						
CF	.7295	.8340	.8817	.8535	1.0000					
CG	.7044	.8125	.8676	.8585	.9021	1.0000				
CH	.7541	.8236	.8908	.8759	.8756	.8505	1.0000			
CI	.6901	.6846	.7229	.7217	.7256	.7017	.7160	1.0000		
CJ	.5702	.6952	.6712	.6840	.6878	.7205	.6958	.7519	1.0000	
CK	.6757	.7181	.7766	.7714	.7787	.7593	.7848	.8995	.8219	1.0000
CL	.6577	.7226	.7690	.7668	.7747	.7703	.7824	.8801	.8314	.9678
CM	.5894	.7337	.7159	.7164	.7474	.7636	.7127	.8132	.8755	.8771
CN	.6206	.7262	.7436	.7281	.7680	.7533	.7455	.8469	.8215	.9154
CO	.6122	.7153	.7135	.7382	.7199	.7194	.7294	.8145	.8976	.8683
CP	.6501	.7151	.7491	.7575	.7691	.7548	.7512	.8602	.8000	.9336

	CL	CM	CN	CO	CP
CL	1.0000				
CM	.8835	1.0000			
CN	.8996	.9068	1.0000		
CO	.8750	.8838	.8700	1.0000	
CP	.9147	.8758	.9148	.8446	1.0000

OF CASES = 1070.0

```
ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

               SCALE          SCALE      CORRECTED
               MEAN          VARIANCE       ITEM-         SQUARED         ALPHA
              IF ITEM        IF ITEM        TOTAL         MULTIPLE        IF ITEM
              DELETED        DELETED     CORRELATION    CORRELATION       DELETED

CA            35.6850        830.9026        .7520          .7097          .9652

CB            35.2794        812.1884        .8381          .8175          .9638

CD            35.4729        807.8603        .8735          .8854          .9633

CE            35.3813        806.1650        .8666          .8527          .9633

CF            35.3869        806.9502        .8750          .8755          .9632

CG            35.2953        807.7406        .8641          .8685          .9634

CH            35.5196        806.5679        .8641          .8612          .9634

CI            35.3692        809.7336        .8748          .8386          .9633

CJ            35.1430        802.7719        .8223          .8517          .9639

CK            35.4869        797.1088        .9274          .9600          .9623

CL            35.4692        797.4485        .9210          .9454          .9624

CM            35.2411        799.3225        .8823          .8940          .9630

CN            35.4393        798.5908        .8990          .9021          .9627

CO            35.1626        798.4356        .8723          .8810          .9631

CP            35.5402        797.4217        .9043          .8996          .9626


RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     16 ITEMS

ALPHA =    .9667           STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9746
```

Table 31

Reliability Analysis: Want to Make Decisions & Importance of Knowing School-Construct Subscale

1.	CD	WANTS DEC MAK-CURRICULUM
2.	CE	WANTS DEC MAK-FINANCES
3.	CA	WANTS DEC MAK-PERSONNEL
4.	CB	WANTS DEC MAK-SCHOOL POLICY
5.	CM	WANTS DEC MAK-SCHOOL GOALS
6.	CQ	WANTS DEC MAK-MAINTENANCE
7.	CJ	WANTS DEC MAK-HOME/SCHOOL RELATIONS
8.	H	IMPORTANCE OF KNOWING SCHOOL

CORRELATION MATRIX

	CD	CE	CA	CB	CM	CQ	CJ	H
CD	1.0000							
CE	.8830	1.0000						
CA	.8236	.8118	1.0000					
CB	.8919	.8836	.8438	1.0000				
CM	.8312	.8518	.7808	.8679	1.0000			
CQ	.1582	.1489	.2591	.1677	.1583	1.0000		
CJ	.7972	.8525	.7342	.8044	.8755	.0677	1.0000	
H	.1357	.1274	.1441	.1521	.1538	-.0103	.1511	1.0000

OF CASES = 1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

	SCALE MEAN IF ITEM DELETED	SCALE VARIANCE IF ITEM DELETED	CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATION	ALPHA IF ITEM DELETED
CD	20.9402	146.9637	.8663	.8449	.8386
CE	20.9355	145.3850	.8747	.8618	.8371
CA	21.2150	151.1418	.8512	.7586	.8421
CB	21.0271	146.4773	.8851	.8728	.8368
CM	21.2215	148.9472	.8639	.8467	.8399
CQ	17.3561	171.8404	.1689	.1104	.9424
CJ	21.1234	150.3945	.7994	.8153	.8459
H	20.4262	199.1503	.1398	.0305	.8944

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS 8 ITEMS

ALPHA = .8777 STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA = .8937

Table 32

Reliability Analysis: Parent Satisfaction with School-Construct Subscale

```
  1.         AV                 Parent Satisfaction- Liberal/Modern Beliefs
  2.         AW                 Parent Satisfaction- Conservative/Traditional Belief
  3.         AZ                 Parent Satisfaction- Sex Education
  4.         BA                 Parent Satisfaction- Homework
  5.         BC                 Parent Satisfaction- Discipline
  6.         BD                 Parent Satisfaction- Ethnic Curriculum
  7.         BE                 Parent Satisfaction- Religion is Taught
  8.         BF                 Parent Satisfaction- Students Express Personal Feelings
  9.         BG                 Parent Satisfaction- Vatican II Ideas
 10.         BH                 Parent Satisfaction- Theory of Evolution
 11.         BI                 Parent Satisfaction- Helping the Poor
 12.         BJ                 Parent Satisfaction- Social Justice Issues

            CORRELATION MATRIX

              AV          AW          AZ          BA          BC          BD          BE          BF          BG          BH

AV          1.0000
AW           .8673      1.0000
AZ           .7361       .7191      1.0000
BA           .6802       .6694       .7323      1.0000
BC           .6966       .6885       .7168       .8260      1.0000
BD           .7344       .7066       .7544       .7602       .7648      1.0000
BE           .7291       .6785       .7385       .8038       .8079       .7562      1.0000
BF           .7586       .7271       .7516       .7586       .7760       .7885       .7817      1.0000
BG           .7697       .7557       .7473       .7022       .7254       .7731       .7414       .8327      1.0000
BH           .7208       .7370       .7218       .6853       .7218       .7274       .6983       .7804       .8305      1.0000
BI           .7597       .7176       .7663       .8249       .8119       .7981       .8217       .8031       .7682       .7444
BJ           .7687       .7156       .7497       .7544       .7675       .7775       .7790       .8235       .7991       .7545

              BI          BJ

BI          1.0000
BJ           .8434      1.0000

      # OF CASES =            1070.0

ITEM-TOTAL STATISTICS

             SCALE        SCALE      CORRECTED
             MEAN       VARIANCE       ITEM-        SQUARED        ALPHA
            IF ITEM      IF ITEM       TOTAL        MULTIPLE      IF ITEM
            DELETED      DELETED    CORRELATION   CORRELATION     DELETED

AV          19.6738     385.9730       .8498         .8126         .9703
AW          19.6738     384.7289       .8234         .7870         .9711
AZ          19.3729     392.7935       .8363         .7037         .9705
BA          19.1607     402.8011       .8383         .7759         .9707
BC          19.1850     399.2436       .8510         .7769         .9704
BD          19.5000     391.4963       .8581         .7450         .9700
BE          19.1776     396.8085       .8546         .7718         .9702
BF          19.7131     387.3423       .8870         .8017         .9693
BG          20.0729     380.1275       .8750         .8065         .9697
BH          19.8822     380.7887       .8379         .7451         .9709
BI          19.3561     396.6299       .8919         .8280         .9695
BJ          19.6551     389.7696       .8802         .7971         .9695

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS     12 ITEMS
ALPHA =    .9726          STANDARDIZED ITEM ALPHA =    .9739
```

PARENTS OF STUDENTS IN CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOLS: A NATIONAL STUDY

The National Catholic Educational Association is conducting a study of Catholic secondary schools here and in other communities in the United States. We have developed this questionnaire for the parents of students in the schools we are studying.

We realize that this questionnaire is long, but we worked very hard to make it as short as possible. We are asking you these questions because we feel that parent opinions on a large number of issues are extremely important for the growth and improvement of Catholic schools. This information is essential for understanding and interpreting the rest of the information we collect in your child's school.

PLEASE TAKE THE TIME TO ANSWER EACH QUESTION IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE. We realize that you may find some questions difficult to answer or you may feel that some questions are personal or are about "sensitive" issues. We are asking you these questions only because we think the answers will give us meaningful information for our study of Catholic high schools. We hope you will cooperate with us in our effort.

Your answers will be kept completely confidential. All information will be immediately returned to our researchers for analysis, and the results will be presented in "averaged" form NOT IN TERMS OF INDIVIDUAL PARENTS.

Please help us in this study. We hope as a result of your cooperation we can see some useful ways of helping all Catholic schools offer the best education possible to their students.

We want you to answer the questions in this questionnaire only for

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the National Catholic Educational Association representative at your school.

Please return the questionnaire as soon as possible in the sealed envelope to the school.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

APPENDIX

PART I:

1) How many of your children are currently enrolled in this school? ___________

2) How many of your other children attended this school? ______________________

3) What is your relation to the oldest child now attending this high school?

_____ Mother _____ Father _____ Other:____________________

4) Do both parents live in the home? _____ Yes _____ No

5) How many adults (over age 18) live in your home? (Count yourself) __________

6) How many children age 18 or under live in your home? ______________________

PART II:

Eventhough you may have more than one child enrolled in this school, think only of the oldest child now enrolled in answering the following questions.

1) As things stand now, how far do you think your child will get? (Mark ONLY ONE)

___Drop out of school before getting a high school diploma

___Graduate from high school and get no more education after that

___Go to trade, business, or vocational school for a year or two after high school

___Go to college for one or two years

___Get a college degree

___Get past college and get a Master's degree

___Get an advanced degree after college (Ph.D., M.D., or law degree)

2) How important do you feel it is for parents to know what goes on in their child's school?

____ Very Important ____ Somewhat Important ____ Not Important at All

3) How much do you feel you know about what goes on in your child's school?

____ A great deal ____ A moderate amount ____ Very little

4) During the last year, about how many times have you talked to your child's teachers?

___ None ___ 1-2 ___ 3-5 ___ 6-10 ___ 10 or more times

5) About how many times did these talks take place in the following settings? (Write the number beside each item as it applies)

_____ Over the phone _____ In a group (back-to-school night, parents meetings)

_____ Individual meetings (parent-teacher conferences)

6) About how many times in the last year did the teacher and/or principal come to your home?

___ None ___ 1-2 ___ 3-5 ___ 6-10 ___ 10 or more times

7) Who usually asks for any personal contact you have with the school?

___ Parent(s) ___ Teachers ___ Guidance counselors ___ Administrators

8) When you make a request for contact with the school concerning your child, how quickly does the school respond to your request?

___ The school usually responds quickly

___ The school responds, but after some delay

___ The school usually doesn't respond at all

___ I never had to contact the school

9) As a parent, you have a variety of reasons for sending your child to a Catholic high school. Listed below are some reasons parents frequently give for choosing a Catholic school.

FOR EACH REASON →	FIRST: How important was each reason in helping you decide to send your child to this school? →			SECOND: Which reason was the most important? (Mark ONLY ONE)
	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not at all Important	
a. Academic reputation	○	○	○	○
b. Child's friends attend	○	○	○	○
c. Teachers	○	○	○	○
d. Athletic programs	○	○	○	○
e. Location	○	○	○	○
f. Presence of religious (priests/brothers/ sisters)	○	○	○	○
g. Buildings and other facilities	○	○	○	○
h. Affordable tuition	○	○	○	○
i. College preparation	○	○	○	○
j. Older brother(s)/ sister(s) attended	○	○	○	○
k. Parent(s) or relative(s) attended	○	○	○	○
l. Special technical courses or training programs	○	○	○	○
m. Child wanted to attend	○	○	○	○
n. Available public schools are unsafe	○	○	○	○
o. School is open to parents' ideas	○	○	○	○
p. Religious education	○	○	○	○
q. Moral training	○	○	○	○
r. School emphasizes programs that help students who have learning problems	○	○	○	○
s. Discipline	○	○	○	○
t. Class size	○	○	○	○
u. Available public school offers a poor or limited curriculum	○	○	○	○
v. Availability of transportation	○	○	○	○
w. Willingness to address social and moral issues	○	○	○	○
x. Positive influence of other students on my child	○	○	○	○
y. School shares my values and beliefs	○	○	○	○
z. Other:__________________	○	○	○	○

(Please return to second question at top of page.)

10) Parents have a variety of expectations about the educational goals of the Catholic high school.

FOR EACH GOAL → FIRST: How important is each goal to you as a parent? → SECOND: Which goal is the most important to you? (Mark ONLY ONE) → THIRD: Which one do you think receives the most emphasis at this school? (Mark ONLY ONE)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Not at All Important	SECOND	THIRD
a. Building community among faculty, students, and parents	○	○	○	○	○	○
b. Developing appreciation of the arts	○	○	○	○	○	○
c. Developing high moral standards and citizenship	○	○	○	○	○	○
d. Developing individual responsibility for the management of one's own learning program	○	○	○	○	○	○
e. Encouraging student understanding, acceptance, and participation in the Catholic church	○	○	○	○	○	○
f. Fostering spiritual development	○	○	○	○	○	○
g. Preparing students for college	○	○	○	○	○	○
h. Preparing students for the labor market	○	○	○	○	○	○
i. Promoting understanding of and commitment to justice	○	○	○	○	○	○
j. Promoting understanding of and commitment to peace	○	○	○	○	○	○
k. Teaching basic skills in writing, reading, and mathematics	○	○	○	○	○	○
l. Teaching life skills (skills needed for surviving in a complex world, interpersonal skills, personal finance, job hunting skills, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○
m. Teaching students how to get along with others	○	○	○	○	○	○

(Please return to second question at top of page.)

11) Below is a list of characteristics that describe the curriculum at some schools.

FIRST: As far as you know are these characteristics a part of the curriculum at this school? → THEN → SECOND: How much emphasis do you think each receives at this school?

Yes	No	I don't Know		Too Much	About Right	Too Little	I don't Know
○	○	○	a. Liberal political beliefs	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	b. Conservative political beliefs	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	c. Modern attitudes towards women and their roles	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	d. Traditional attitudes towards women and their roles	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	e. Sex education	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	f. Homework	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	g. Discipline	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	h. Minority representation in the curriculum	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	i. Teaching religion	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	j. Teachers ask students to talk about their personal feelings	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	k. Vatican II ideas	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	l. Theory of evolution	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	m. Helping the poor	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	n. Social justice issues	○	○	○	○

12) Below is a list of areas about which parents may or may not advise and/or help make decisions for this school.

FOR EACH OF THESE AREAS → FIRST: Do you advise and/or help to make decisions for this school? → SECOND: If you do not would you like to?

	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. Hiring and firing teachers	○	○	○	○
b. Standards for student behavior (i.e., discipline policy)	○	○	○	○
c. The way students are graded	○	○	○	○
d. How the school budget is spent	○	○	○	○
e. What textbooks or other learning materials are used	○	○	○	○
f. What subjects are taught	○	○	○	○
g. How subjects are taught	○	○	○	○
h. Hiring and firing of administrators	○	○	○	○
i. Ways the school and parents work together	○	○	○	○
j. The school's daily schedule	○	○	○	○
k. The way religion is taught	○	○	○	○
l. Setting school goals	○	○	○	○
m. Setting admission policy	○	○	○	○
n. How money is raised	○	○	○	○
o. Setting teachers' salaries	○	○	○	○
p. Helping solve school maintenance problems	○	○	○	○

(Please return to second question at top.)

13) Below is a list of ways in which parents might participate in school activities.

FOR EACH WAY → FIRST: How IMPORTANT do you think it is for parents to participate? → SECOND: Have you ever participated?

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not at All Important	Yes	No
a. Acting as a teacher or substitute teacher	○	○	○	○	○
b. Acting as a classroom aide or tutor	○	○	○	○	○
c. Serving as a School Board, Advisory, or Parent Board Member	○	○	○	○	○
d. Attending Parent meetings	○	○	○	○	○
e. Acting as a guest speaker	○	○	○	○	○
f. Attending meetings to discuss local, social, and political issues	○	○	○	○	○
g. Attending meetings to discuss other community problems	○	○	○	○	○
h. Attending meetings to discuss school problems	○	○	○	○	○
i. Helping with class trips	○	○	○	○	○
j. Helping with extra-curricular activities (e.g., sports, music, plays, driving, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○
k. Making sure homework is done	○	○	○	○	○
l. Helping with school maintenance	○	○	○	○	○

14) Mark whether or not any of the following have prevented you from being involved in activities at this school during the past year.

	Yes	No
a. Baby sitting/child care	○	○
b. Lack of transportation to get to the school	○	○
c. Principal's and teachers' attitudes	○	○
d. Conflict with my working hours	○	○
e. My belief that it is the job of the principal and the teachers to run the school	○	○
f. Different language spoken by the school people	○	○
g. Other:____________________________	○	○

15) Below is a list of things that could be problems at any school.

FIRST: To what extent do you think each is a problem at this school? → THEN → SECOND: If you had to choose the one biggest problem at this school which one would it be? (Please mark ONLY ONE)

Not a Problem	Minor Problem	Major Problem		Biggest Problem
○	○	○	a. Student misbehavior (fighting, stealing, etc.)	○
○	○	○	b. Poor curriculum	○
○	○	○	c. Low teacher salaries	○
○	○	○	d. Prejudice/Racial conflict	○
○	○	○	e. Poor teachers or teaching	○
○	○	○	f. School too small	○
○	○	○	g. School too large	○
○	○	○	h. Classes are overcrowded	○
○	○	○	i. Teachers don't discipline students	○
○	○	○	j. Inadequate resources (such as personnel, buildings, equipment, and materials)	○
○	○	○	k. The attitude of the principal and others who run this school	○
○	○	○	l. Lack of student interest (poor school spirit, students don't want to learn, etc.)	○
○	○	○	m. Too many rules and regulations	○
○	○	○	n. Lack of enough money to operate school adequately	○
○	○	○	o. Lack of parent interest	○
○	○	○	p. Lack of staff interest in good parent/school relations	○
○	○	○	q. Racial composition of student body	○
○	○	○	r. Gender composition of student body	○
○	○	○	s. Lack of after school activities	○

(Please return to second question at top of page.)

16) What is your highest level of education? (Please mark ONLY ONE)

____ Completed eighth grade or less
____ Had some high school, but didn't finish
____ Completed high school
____ Completed technical, vocation, trade, or business school
____ Had some college, but didn't finish
____ Graduated from a two-year college
____ Graduated from a 4-year college or university
____ Completed a post-graduate or professional degree

17) How satisfied are you with your own level of education? (Please mark ONLY ONE)

_____ Very satisfied
_____ Somewhat satisfied
_____ Somewhat dissatisfied
_____ Very dissatisfied

18) How many years did you attend

_____ Catholic elementary school?
_____ Catholic high school?

19) What kind of financial assistance does your child receive for schooling that comes from outside the home?

____ None
____ Partial school scholarship
____ Full school scholarship
____ Sponsorship of a relative
____ Sponsorship of a patron not a relative
____ Other:________________________

20) How many hours a week does your child earn money by working outside the home?

____ None
____ 1-5 hours
____ 6-10 hours
____ 11-20 hours
____ 21 or more hours

21) To what extent does your child financially contribute toward schooling by working? (Mark ALL that apply)

____ None
____ Partial tuition
____ Full tuition
____ Books, supplies
____ Transportation
____ Clothing
____ Entertainment

22) What is the approximate total family income per year? (Please mark ONE)

____ Less than $5,000
____ $5,001-$10,000
____ $10,001-$15,000
____ $15,001-$20,000
____ $20,001-$30,000
____ $30,001-$50,000
____ $50,001-$100,000
____ Over $100,000

23) Which of the following best describes your racial/ethnic background?

_____ White/Caucasian/Anglo
_____ Black/Negro/Afro-American
_____ Oriental/Asian American
_____ Mexican American/Mexican/Chicano
_____ Cuban/Puerto Rican/ Other Latin American
_____ American Indian
_____ Other:______________________
____

24) In what kind of housing do you live?

____ Owner-occupied house, condominium, or townhouse
____ Single or duplex rental
____ Multiple unit rental
____ Government-subsidized housing
____ Other:______________________
____

25) Is the mother in this family employed outside the home?

_____ Full-time _____ Part-time _____ Not at all

26) Is the father in this family employed outside the home?

_____ Full-time _____ Part-time _____ Not at all

27) How would you describe the political beliefs of most of the people who send their children to this school?

_____ Strongly conservative
_____ Conservative
_____ Moderate
_____ Liberal
_____ Strongly Liberal

28) How would you describe your own political beliefs?

_____ Strongly conservative
_____ Conservative
_____ Moderate
_____ Liberal
_____ Strongly Liberal

29) Are you Catholic? _____ Yes _____ No

30) If yes, how much do you participate in parish or other church activities?

_____ Weekly
_____ Monthly
_____ A few times a year
_____ Not at all

31) If you are not a Catholic, how much do you participate in church or religious activities?

_____ Weekly
_____ Monthly
_____ A few times a year
_____ Not at all

BEFORE ANSWERING THE LAST QUESTION ON THE NEXT PAGE, PLEASE CHECK BACK TO BE SURE YOU ANSWERED ALL OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS. THANK YOU

32) If there are any comments you would like to make or concerns you have about this study or about the school, please write them here.

Thank you very much for your participation in this survey. Please return your questionnaire in the sealed envelope to the school or mail to:

NCEA Catholic High School Study
Center for the Study of Youth Development
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C. 20064

APPENDIX B

PARENT SURVEY
VARIABLE COMBINATIONS ANALYSIS
VARIABLE KEY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

MASTER KEY

I. INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
C	Responder
FL	Political Beliefs- Other Parents
FM	Political Beliefs- Own
FN	Religion- Catholic
FO	Religion- Catholic Church Participation
FP	Religion- Non-Catholic Church Participation
ES	Educational Attainment
ET	Schooling Experience- Satisfaction with Educational Attainment
EU	Catholic Schooling- Elementary
EV	Catholic Schooling- High School
FG	Socio-economic Status- Income
FH	Socio-economic Status- Ethnicity
FI	Socio-economic Status- Housing

II. FAMILY FACTORS

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
A	Children Attending this School
B	Children Attended this School
F	Home Conditions- Children at Home
E	Home Conditions- Crowding at Home
FJ	Home Conditions- Parents Working

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
EX	Home Conditions- Child Working
D	Home Conditions- Parent Absent
EW	Financial Aid- Source of Aid
EZ	Financial Aid- Child's Contribution to Schooling- A
FC	Financial Aid- Child's Contribution to Schooling- B
G	Expectations for Child's Educational Attainment

III. PARENT EXPECTATIONS OF SCHOOL

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
XX	School Goals- Intellectual
RR	School Goals- Social/Community
SS	School Goals- Personal/Religious
YY	School Goals- Vocational/Survival
AF	School Goals- Priority of Above
	Reasons for Choosing School- Importance
Q	Academic/Curriculum
V	Religion/Values
II	Discipline
R	Child's Choice
U	Convenience/Safety
X	Affordable Tuition
T	Athletics
QQ	Reasons for Choosing School- Priority

IV. PARENT PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
AG	Goal School Most Emphasizes
	School Problems
DY	Curriculum/Teachers
EA	Finances
EO	Student Body Composition
DX	Moral/Ethical Behavior
EC	School Conditions
EK	School Policy
EJ	Poor Attitude/Lack of Interest
ER	Biggest Problem with School

VARIABLE LABELS	VARIABLE DEFINITIONS
	School Curriculum- Characteristics
AH	Liberal/Modern Beliefs-Attitudes
AI	Conservative/Traditional Beliefs-Attitudes
AL	Sex Education
AM	Homework
AN	Discipline
AO	Ethnic Curriculum
AP	Religion
AQ	Students Express Personal Feelings

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
AR	Vatican II Ideas
AS	Theory of Evolution
AT	Helping the Poor
AU	Social Justice Issues

V. PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL RELATED ACTIVITIES

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
DM	Participators- Helpers
DO	Participators- Homework Monitors
DH	Participators- Attenders
DG	Participators- Board Members
DE	Participators- Teachers & Aides
BM	Decision Makers- Curriculum
BN	Decision Makers- Finances
BK	Decision Makers- Personnel
BL	Decision Makers- School Policy
BV	Decision Makers- School Goals
BZ	Decision Makers- Maintenance
BS	Decision Makers- Home/School Relations
J	Communicators- Talks with Teachers
K	Communicators- Setting for Talks Telephone
L	Communicators- Setting for Talks Parent Meetings
M	Communicators- Setting for Talks Parent-Teacher Conferences
O	Responsiveness- Parent Usually Initiates Talks

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
P	Responsiveness- School Response to Parents
	Reasons for Non-Participation
DQ	Child Care
DR	Transportation
DT	Working Hours
DS	Attitude-Language Differences
DW	Other Reasons

VI. PARENT SCHOOL AND CURRICULUM KNOWLEDGE

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE LABEL
I	General School Knowledge
	Curriculum Knowledge- General Characteristics
AH	Liberal/Modern Belief-Attitudes
AI	Conservative/Traditional Beliefs-Attitudes
AL	Sex Education
AM	Homework
AN	Discipline
AO	Ethnic Curriculum
AP	Religion
AQ	Students Express Personal Feelings
AR	Vatican II Ideas
AS	Theory of Evolution
AT	Helping the Poor
AU	Social Justice Issues

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
	Curriculum Emphasis
AV	Liberal/Modern Beliefs-Attitudes
AW	Conservative/Traditional Beliefs-Attitudes
AZ	Sex Education
BA	Homework
BC	Discipline
BD	Ethnic Curriculum
BE	Religion
BF	Students Express Personal Feelings
BG	Vatican II Ideas
BH	Theory of Evolution
BI	Helping the Poor
BJ	Social Justice Issues

VII. PARENTS ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
	Importance of Participation at School
CZ	Helpers
DB	Homework Monitors
CU	Attenders
CT	Board Members
CR	Teachers & Aides

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
	Want to Make Decisions on
CD	Curriculum
CE	Finances
CA	Personnel
CB	School Policy
CM	School Goals
CQ	Maintenance
CJ	Home-School Relations
H	Important to Know School

VIII. PARENT SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL

VARIABLE LABEL	VARIABLE DEFINITION
AV	Liberal/Modern Beliefs-Attitudes
AW	Conservative/Traditional Beliefs-Attitudes
AZ	Sex Education
BA	Homework
BC	Discipline
BD	Ethnic Curriculum
BE	Religion
BF	Students Express Personal Feelings
BG	Vatican II Ideas
BH	Theory of Evolution
BI	Helping the Poor
BJ	Social Justice Issues